

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 322

BC 011 212

AUTHOR Barton, Amy E.
TITLE Campesinas: Women Farmworkers in the California Agricultural Labor Force. Report of a Study Project by The California Commission on the Status of Women.
INSTITUTION California State Commission on the Status of Women, Sacramento.
SPONS AGENCY California Employment Development Dept., Los Angeles.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 77p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Laborers; Demography; Economic Disadvantage; Employer Attitudes; *Employment Practices; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Field Interviews; Mexican Americans; *Migrant Workers; Needs Assessment; Occupational Mobility; Research Projects; Seasonal Laborers; Social Services; *Socioeconomic Background; Statistical Data; *Work Attitudes; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A one year descriptive study of demographic characteristics, employment situations, and supportive services needs of women farmworkers in the California labor force was conducted in 1977-78. Data were collected in interviews with both employers and 400 women and 200 men engaged in farmwork in Fresno and Imperial Counties. Most of the women were of Mexican extraction, were between 21 and 29 years of age, and had between one and seven years of school. Their average annual income was just under \$3000, yet over one-third were heads of households. Confined to lower paying jobs of a more sporadic nature, they had annual incomes two-thirds less than that of male farmworkers. The women lacked upward job mobility; employers believed the higher paying, more skilled tasks were beyond a woman's physical capabilities. The women themselves felt capable of pursuing physically demanding work. Some tables in this document summarize responses by male and female workers to questions on such topics as ethnic background, age, religion, marital status, earnings, experience, education, housing, crops worked, union interests, job training, and types of work done. Fifteen tables present responses made by employers on questions concerning such areas as farm size and type, years in farming, and attitudes toward various aspects of employment of women workers. (DS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paula Faust
State of Calif. Comm. on
Status of Women
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CAMPESINAS

WOMEN FARMWORKERS IN THE CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL LABOR FORCE



**A REPORT BY THE CALIFORNIA
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS
OF WOMEN**

**MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON
THE STATUS OF WOMEN**

PUBLIC MEMBERS

Betty Stephens, Chairperson
Dorothy Ford
Gloria Harrison
Irene Hirano
Beth Jackson
Anita Miller
Bonnie Parks
Maxine Ussery
Altha Williams

LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS

Assemblyman Eugene A. Chappie
Assemblyman Gary Hart
Assemblywoman Maxine Waters

Senator Lou Cusanovich
Senator David A. Roberti
Senator Alan Sieroty

STATUTORY MEMBERS

Dr. Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction
James L. Quillin, Chief, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement

STAFF

Pamela Faust, Executive Director
La Sonya Jones, Assistant to the Director
Helyne Meshar, Legislative Coordinator
Margaret Fjeldsted, Information Officer
Vichi Caron, Resouce Specialist

Julie Kouri, Staff Secretary
Carolann Parsons, Secretary
Dianne Start, Secretary

CAMPESINAS:

WOMEN FARMWORKERS IN THE CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL LABOR FORCE

**Report of a Study Project by
The California Commission on the Status of Women**

**Susana Halfon, Project Director
Amy E. Barton, Project Designer and Principal Author
Margaret Gipe, Project Secretary**

**California Commission on the
Status of Women
926 J Street, Room 1506
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor**

DECEMBER 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS	vi
FINDINGS	1
RECOMMENDATIONS	2
CHAPTER I	5
A PROFILE OF CALIFORNIA'S WOMEN FARMWORKERS	
CHAPTER II.....	11
A COMPARISON OF SOCIAL SERVICES NEEDED WITH SOCIAL SERVICES PROVIDED	
CHAPTER III	15
A COMPARISON OF EMPLOYMENT SITUATIONS AND OPTIONS FOR WOMEN AND MEN	
CHAPTER IV	17
CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT	
CHAPTER V.....	19
METHODOLOGY	
LIST OF TABLES.....	A-1
TABLES	A-5
APPENDIX	A-45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	A-47

ABSTRACT

This report provides summary profiles of a data base which has been compiled in order to describe California's women farmworkers. It also presents a discussion of the differences in employment characteristics for men and women farmworkers. It presents a profile of the expressed social service needs of women farmworkers and compares them to services provided by state agencies. Finally, it discusses women agricultural workers' attitudes toward farmwork and the attitudes of agricultural employers toward women farmworkers, and makes a series of projections for future study, based on the attitudes of these employers and employees.

In summary, the findings show that:

1. Women make up a significant portion of the agricultural labor force and are important contributors to their family's income.
2. Women farmworkers do not have upward job mobility, since better jobs are presumed to require more strength.
3. Women farmworkers have lower annual incomes than men, primarily due to the differential in job status and the pay rates for low-status jobs.
4. Women, and men, overwhelmingly want to leave farmwork unless working conditions, pay and benefits, and housing improve.
5. Many women farmworkers are United States citizens and tax-paying residents.
6. Women farmworkers have had very little opportunity to participate in job training programs.
7. Women farmworkers would like to have affordable and geographically accessible child care centers.
8. Farmworkers, both male and female, overwhelmingly cite a need for increased health care services. There is a great demand for multi-service clinics where there is flexibility in the hours the clinics are open.
9. Women feel there is a need for more migrant camp housing, as well as better facilities within the camps already provided.
10. Women farmworkers cited primary on-the-job risks to their health and safety as:
 - a. Mechanized processes
 - b. Field conditions
 - c. Unsafe use of chemicals
 - d. Lack of adequate sanitation facilities.

Women farmworkers are not a surplus labor force, since they earn most of their income from farmwork, work a significant part of the year in farmwork, and are often heads of households. In spite of the considerable role they play in the agricultural labor force, they face barriers to upward job mobility, fuller employment, and higher annual incomes. They are often tax-paying residents of the United States, yet lack basic facilities such as adequate housing and health care. They are clear about the positive and negative aspects of agricultural work, and seek improved work conditions and benefits only to the degree of comparability with other employment sectors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CAMPESINA: WOMEN FARMWORKERS IN THE CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL LABOR FORCE is a report by the California Commission on the Status of Women. The one-year study on which this report is based was supported by Governor's Discretionary Funds, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, as administered by the California Employment Development Department. The staff of the Women in the California Agricultural Labor Force project are very grateful to those individuals in the CETA staff and EDD staff who assisted us in gaining the grant and who were both meticulous and sympathetic in their supervision of the study.

In addition, we are very thankful for the assistance and support of our Advisory Board. The concern, advice, and knowledge of the Board's official and ex-officio members were instrumental to the completion of this project. The Board members' willingness to give their time and energies is a gift gratefully received and remembered.

We would also like to thank all the exceptional people who have worked with us on this project. Project interviewers, community groups in Fresno and Imperial, and the Division of Social Sciences computer staff at the University of California, Santa Cruz are only some of those whose contributions have been essential to the study.

Finally, we express our gratitude and appreciation to the many individuals who have directly and indirectly contributed their effort and concern to both the project and the staff.

Susana Halfon, Project Director

Amy E. Barton, Project Designer and Principal Author

Margaret Gipe, Project Secretary

Pamela Faust, California Commission on the Status of Women, Executive Director

ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Esther Banez
La Cooperativa Campesina
Vallejo

Jessie de la Cruz
National Land for People
Fresno

Angela Diaz
State of California Employment
Development Department

Jonathan Field
State of California, Department of
Food and Agriculture
Sacramento

Hope Fierro
Universidad de Campesinos Libres
Fresno

Olivia Garcia
La Cooperativa Campesina
Kerman

Richard Graeser
Grower
Holtville

Gloria Macias Harrison
Commissioner, California Commission
on the Status of Women
Colton

Irene Hirano
Commissioner, California Commission
on the Status of Women
Los Angeles

Jake Kiriara
Grower
Livingston

Emma Pulido
Campesinos Unidos
Brawley

Lupe Quintero
California Rural Legal Assistance
El Centro

Maria Rodriguez
Calexico

FINDINGS

The California Commission on the Status of Women has completed a one-year descriptive study of the demographic characteristics, employment situations, and supportive services needs of women farmworkers in the California agricultural labor force. Some of the most important demographic characteristics of women farmworkers are:

1. The average annual income for a woman farmworker in California is just under \$3,000.
2. The discrepancy in income between male and female farmworkers results from women's confinement to lower-paying tasks, resulting in annual incomes two-thirds less than those of male farmworkers.
3. One-third of the women respondents declare themselves as heads of households, and the majority of respondents devote their earnings to basic maintenance of their family.
4. Three-quarters of the women farmworkers report that their total annual income is earned in agriculture. Ninety percent report their total annual family income is earned in California.
5. Almost three-quarters of the women declare a home base in California. Sixty-three percent declare themselves as paying United States income tax. Forty-four percent are United States citizens, with another 28.9 percent holding greencards.

Notable employment characteristics for women farmworkers are:

1. Women farmworkers are overwhelmingly employed in the low-status and low-paying tasks of weeding, thinning, and hoeing, with some harvesting work. The brief and sporadic nature of these tasks leads to women being employed fewer weeks of the year than men.
2. Women lack upward job mobility. Employers believe that the higher-paying, more skilled tasks are beyond a woman's physical capabilities, but the women themselves feel capable of pursuing physically demanding work.

Women farmworkers' support services needs include:

1. Better endorsement of laws providing for on-the-job health and safety.
2. Geographically accessible, low-cost, multi-service health care clinics, staffed by fully bilingual professionals.
3. Geographically accessible, low-cost child care centers, offering comprehensive health care for children as well as bilingual and bicultural educational and recreational programs.
4. Increased migrant housing, both in terms of the number of units as well as the number of camp locations.
5. Improvement in the quality of existing camp housing.
6. Bilingual educational and job training programs for women.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Economic Development

1. Job training programs for farmworker women in California under CETA, Titles I, II, III, IV, and VI, should encompass apprenticeship in non-traditional jobs in both agricultural and non-agricultural employment sectors. In addition, job training agencies must incorporate English as a part of job training, thus teaching language in a relevant context. Agencies offering job training to women must also provide support services, such as:
 - child care
 - transportation
 - family involvement in pretraining to assure support by the non-participant spouse
 - survival skill courses which utilize group concepts (banking, budgeting, marketing)
 - assertiveness training courses.

In addition, a standard definition of migrant and seasonal farmworkers that does not exclude family members from participation in training programs provided through CETA must be developed.

2. Job training which prepares women farmworkers to provide services to other women farmworkers should be undertaken (for example, as legal paraprofessionals). Also, job training for farmworker women as outreach and community workers to the migrant seasonal farmworkers should be undertaken to resolve unemployment and gaps in service delivery due to lack of information.
3. Cooperatives, such as providers of child care, and small business opportunities for women farmworkers must be investigated and actively advertised and extended throughout the farmworker communities.
4. Both in terms of housing and economic development, attention should be given to the enforcement of the 1902 Reclamation Act so that farmworkers may have access to land ownership.

Employment Conditions

1. Employers must be advised that under the Fair Employment Practices Act, they may not refrain from hiring women applicants on the supposition that they have physical limitations based on their sex.
2. The Department of Industrial Relations and Cal/OSHA should strongly enforce safety regulations, particularly in regard to inspection procedures for agricultural machinery. There must be better enforcement of regulations providing for adequate sanitation facilities in the fields, particularly for women.
3. The Department of Industrial Relations and Cal/OSHA should institute statewide bilingual employer-employee safety and education programs which should include bilingual outreach workers; distribution of bilingual written materials; slide presentations on pesticide poisoning symptoms (for those unable to read either English or Spanish), on-the-job health hazards, complaint procedures and preventive measures.

4. There must be clarification of jurisdiction over pesticides by the Departments of Agriculture, and Industrial Relations, and appropriate health-related departments. These departments should separately or jointly undertake research on the chronic effects of pesticides, train physicians to recognize symptoms of pesticide poisoning, and undertake research on alternatives to spraying for achieving pest control.
5. EDD should mount informational programs advising women farmworkers that pregnancies may be partially covered by Disability Insurance.

Support Services and Delivery

1. Multiservice centers should be established which provide health care, child care, legal aid, and in-center and outreach information about rights under existing laws, social service eligibility, job training referrals and vocational counseling, and health and safety regulations. Transportation for women and children to these centers should be provided. Staffing should be bicultural and bilingual and provide on-the-job training for women as service delivery workers. Child care centers should be developmentally oriented, with services offered in a wide range of hours. Health care services should be multiphasic and preventive as well as curative. Centers should have professional bilingual staff and be open a wide range of hours. Service should include 24-hour emergency health care, primary care, ophthalmology, dentistry, obstetrical and gynecological care, psychological, family planning, and nutritional counseling.
2. Wherever possible, multiservice centers should be cooperatively organized and administered by farmworkers, particularly women farmworkers.
3. There must be an increase in low-income subsidized housing; legislation should be enacted to counterbalance Article 34 in order to allow for the construction of low-income housing.
4. Rent control should be instituted and information on tenants' rights should be provided.
5. Housing should be made available for single women farmworkers, as it is for men farmworkers.
6. Increased enforcement of housing code regulations is necessary.

CHAPTER I

A PROFILE OF CALIFORNIA'S WOMEN FARMWORKERS

One major interest guided the development of this study: to identify the employment and social characteristics of women agricultural farmworkers in California. Farmworker women, long a part of an industry which is of prime importance to California's economic position, have remained "invisible" for an equally long period of time.

Descriptive demographic studies of the farmworker population as a whole, or similar studies of male farmworkers, are comparatively rare; descriptive demographic information on farmworker women has been virtually non-existent. Not only has there been an almost total absence of basic census-type information about farmworker women, but there has also been a lack of data concerning their occupational status and the specific characteristics of their employment situations. In addition, since women agricultural farmworkers constitute essentially a disenfranchised population, social services tend to be provided without channels for ascertaining whether or not these are the services most desired by women farmworkers, and in a form of delivery which maximizes accessibility.

This report provides objective data about, and concrete recommendations for, assisting women farmworkers in their employment situations and within their communities as well.

The study concerned itself with four main objectives:

1. Develop a census-type data base of social, economic, and demographic characteristics of farmworker women.
2. Identify the employment situation of women farmworkers; for example, the types of tasks in which they are typically engaged, annual income, job mobility, methods of payment, types of job recruitment, etc.
3. Ascertain the expressed needs of women farmworkers for social services and modes of provision of social services; then compare these views with the social services currently delivered to these women.
4. Explore the views and experiences of agricultural employers with respect to women performing agricultural field work.

The data on which this study is based, was collected from 400 women and 200 men engaged in farmwork in Fresno and Imperial Counties. Although many of *Campesina's* findings may appear to reaffirm the obvious, it is important to remember that this is the first study to document the social, economic, and employment characteristics of California's female fieldworkers. It may be appropriately considered as providing a basis for future collection and analysis of data.

DATA BASE PROFILE: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

The sample of women interviewed largely reported themselves as being of Mexican extraction, either as Mexican or Mexican-American. More women reported themselves Mexican in Imperial than in Fresno County (see Table 1). The bulk of women in the sample give 21 - 29 years as their age, with the next heaviest concentrations being between 40 - 49 years and then 30 - 39 years. There are more very young women working in Fresno, and more women over 56 working in Imperial (see Table 2). In both counties, women farmworkers reported themselves as Catholic, with a somewhat higher percentage of declared Catholics occurring in Imperial rather than in Fresno (see Table

3).^{1/} A great majority of respondents cite themselves as married, but a third of the total respondents, including the small percentage of single women, also declare themselves as heads of household (see Tables 4 and 5). This finding may suggest that women engaged in agricultural farmwork are working for basic support. They are not engaged in a part-time occupation to provide "extras"; they are not simply a surplus labor pool, but are a significant and integrated part of the labor force.

Although the bulk of the respondents are of Mexican extraction, almost half are United States citizens. Many others hold greencard status. The rate of both citizenship and greencard status is higher for women than for men (see Table 6). This is of some interest, since it indicates that women are less likely to be *sin documentos* than men. One logical inference from this finding about citizenship is that women with children, as citizens, could have services to which *sin documentos* lack access.

A considerable percentage of women farmworkers report receiving some education in the United States, and one-quarter of the population report having nine or more years of school. Most women, however, have only between one and seven years of school, and a relatively small percentage appear to have no education at all (see Table 7). However, this overall finding must be qualified in that there has been no measure applied to prove the quality of education received.^{2/}

This is similar to the qualification offered with respect to reading and writing in English and Spanish. Respondents may report themselves to read and write both English and Spanish. Approximately one-quarter of the respondents report themselves as reading and writing English; one-half of the respondents report themselves to read and write Spanish. These are total percentages for females in Fresno and Imperial; there is no considerable differentiation in reported language competency between counties. Further, there was no test administered to check competency in languages written and read, and, therefore, these findings are the women's self perceptions. It is entirely possible that although they can to some degree in fact read and write in English and in Spanish, they may not have the competency required by some employers for higher paying jobs (see Tables 8 and 9). However, it is necessary to note that no matter what the reported competency, a quarter of the women were interviewed in English, and slightly over half in Spanish; more women appear to be more comfortable with Spanish (see Table 10). Women in Fresno have better reported English skills than men in Fresno, but the reverse is true in Imperial.

The bulk of both the Fresno and Imperial respondents declare permanent residence in the United States (see Table 12). The majority of the respondents do have a permanent residence they consider their home base, and these residences are more often houses than apartments, trailers, or any other form of accommodation. Although they may be residing in houses, more of these houses are rented than are owned by the respondents (see Tables 13, 14, 15). About half the respondents are like the majority of California residents, building equity for landlords in their home base district. This particular data does not support the popular conception that these farmworkers take all their income back to Mexico. In Imperial, the houses are described as having three to four rooms, while in Fresno most of the houses are described as having seven or more rooms. Only half of the respondents report having separate kitchen and bathroom facilities. Lack of proper sanitation facilities may make possible to some extent an inference about the quality of many of the houses (see Tables 16 and 17A/B).

Most respondents report sharing their house with five to six others. Generally there are one or two wage earners in the house, and the rest dependents. Most report living in the same house for between three months and five years (see Tables 18-21).

^{1/} The findings of religion and ethnicity showing more Mexicans and more Catholics in Imperial can probably be traced to the proximity of Imperial to the Mexican border. When the data were checked to see whether or not Mexican residence particularly affected the significance of the findings, it was found not to introduce bias into the social service expressed needs; therefore the place of residence has not been separated out from the findings as discussed and presented regarding services. However, differences between the two counties show, in some instances, significant variance in demographic findings.

^{2/} There is a contention that the quality of education may be affected by the location of the education system (United States or Mexico), since it has been argued that Mexican grammar schools are generally one to two years more advanced in curricula than the U.S. counterpart.

The descriptive profile which emerges differs from some of the myths which surround this population. Women engaged in agricultural occupations are often citizens, make their home and build property value in the United States, as well as purchase United States goods from local businesses. They are part of family units of generally about seven persons, and only two or sometimes only one of these persons bring in a wage. They live primarily in rental housing, and much of it appears to be below code in terms of sanitation facilities. However, they appear to have more education than is popularly thought, and are relatively stable residents of California.

DATA BASE PROFILE: ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

A large number of women report that their total annual income is earned in California and is earned doing farmwork (see Tables 22 and 23). An equally large percentage report paying United States income tax. In fact, it may be significant that more Imperial respondents report themselves as tax paying, since it raises doubt about the argument that border proximity increases tax evasion. Most of the women earn \$100 - \$124 a week.^{3/} And when asked how much they had earned in the last two weeks, the average was \$213. Average annual incomes for female farmworkers are under \$3,000. The bulk of their incomes is devoted to family support (Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27). During periods of unemployment, many collect Unemployment Insurance as a means of assistance. A greater number report receiving no assistance at all than report receiving welfare (see Table 28).

The study shows that incomes earned in California are spent in California, that these women tend to be taxpayers, and although their incomes are small, they are not consistently collecting welfare. The incomes of women farmworkers from their employment will be examined more closely in the following chapter when contrasted to the incomes of male farmworkers.

DATA BASE PROFILE: EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Most of the women respondents reported that they come from families who have been engaged in farmwork for several generations, and that most of their families have not participated in occupations other than agricultural ones (see Tables 29 and 30). Of those families where various members have been engaged in non-agricultural occupations, either permanently or temporarily, the majority were engaged in blue-collar jobs (see Table 31). This participation in blue-collar employment activities is inconsistent with those non-agricultural occupations which would be preferred by the women respondents themselves, who rank white-collar highest (see Table 33). Not surprisingly, although women respondents report some participation in domestic house care employment, no men reported having participated in this category. Besides white-collar tasks, blue-collar jobs and public service employment rank high as these which the respondents have attempted to pursue. The reasons they give for moving from these types of employment are discussed in detail in the following chapter, since reasons differ for male and female respondents. However, it does bear mentioning here that, for women respondents, home and child care responsibilities clearly appear as a reason for not pursuing occupations in the non-agricultural sector (see Table 85).

Most of the female respondents in the study report that they have been engaged in agriculture for five years or less, with the next highest grouping at 6-8 years (see Table 32). Generally, women will work for six or more employers in a year, and yet, defining a migrant as an individual who spends more than five weeks away from home base in a year to pursue agricultural work, most of the women have a low migrancy score, i.e., less than five weeks away from their home base. There is a considerably higher percentage of Imperial respondents reporting as migrant than Fresno respondents (see Tables 34 and 35). When traveling to work, most women report themselves as being in their own car or in a car pool, but the percentage of women traveling to work by bus is higher in Imperial

^{3/} All incomes on a weekly basis of reporting show average or actual amounts earned when work is available.

than Fresno. This is not surprising, since it is consistent with the agricultural employers' greater use of labor contractors in Imperial than Fresno (see Table 36). Most of the women respondents reporting themselves to be away fewer than five weeks travel to work alone, and those with a higher degree of migrancy travel to work with members of their family, primarily their spouse, children, siblings, and parents (see Tables 37 and 38).

Most of the women reported themselves as the most fully employed during the summer season, which was defined as the period between April and September. During the summer season, women reported themselves as having 10-19 weeks of work in contrast to the winter season (October - March), where the greater percentage reported themselves as having 0 - 4 weeks of work (see Tables 39, 40, and 44). During these seasons, appropriate to the crops' growing cycles, Fresno women report their major crop as grapes, followed by tomatoes. Imperial, on the other hand, shows lettuce as the major crop reported, followed by miscellaneous vegetable crops (see Tables 42 and 43).

No matter in what crop and in what season they are working, the highest number of women respondents report themselves as doing the following tasks in order of frequency: weeding, thinning, and hoeing, with some harvesting. Fresno respondents report more harvest employment than Imperial respondents, who report a greater amount of weeding (see Table 44). Almost three-quarters of the women respondents report that they prefer to be paid on an hourly rather than a piece-rate basis, regardless of the type of work activity in which they are engaged (see Table 45).

When asked about the effect of mechanization on their work, most of the respondents who answered in Fresno felt that machines had affected the crops in which they work; most respondents in Imperial did not feel machines had had an impact on the crops in which they work. Of those respondents who felt mechanization had had an impact on the crops in which they worked, most respondents felt that this had either caused them to lose a job or had made no difference to them. A very small percentage reported an increase in employment due to machines (see Tables 46 and 47). When asked about what types of jobs they perform if they work with machines, a large number of responses fell within the "sort and clean" category. Again, of those who felt an impact of machines, those responding indicated that they prefer to work without, rather than with, machines (see Tables 48 and 49).

Most of the female respondents in Fresno report themselves as not ever having belonged to a union; the reverse is true for Imperial respondents. Female respondents from both counties report themselves as being in favor of a union representing their interests in negotiating with employers. Of those respondents that belong to a union now, the greater proportion of responses indicated that they feel their union does represent their interests (see Tables 50, 51 and 52).

Given that there may be a decline in the number of agricultural jobs available if the trend toward mechanization continues in agricultural production, a series of questions explored previous encounters by respondents with job training programs, and their preferences about staying in agricultural work or moving into another employment area. Very few of the respondents reported themselves as having been referred to a job training program, although a somewhat higher number reported that they had heard of job training programs which sounded interesting to them (see Tables 53 and 54). Very few respondents reported themselves as having participated in any job training program in California, but of those who had, a higher percentage of female respondents than male respondents felt that the training had been useful (see Tables 55 and 56). Most respondents would like to pursue non-agricultural employment, if the work conditions in agriculture remain the same. If the conditions in agriculture were to improve, e.g., higher rates of pay, better benefits, enforcement of health and safety regulations, and better living conditions, then just over half would change rather than the three-quarters wishing to change if conditions did not improve (see Tables 57 and 58).

The employment characteristics of women farmworkers, then, show that they are performing the lowest-level jobs, there are few opportunities for job training and advancement in the present agricultural employment situation, they have a low degree of migrancy, and prefer an hourly rate of pay to piece-rate pay.

DATA BASE PROFILE: EXPRESSED SOCIAL SERVICE NEEDS

The social services explored in this study were child care, health care, and housing. In addition to seeking the current perceptions about such services as expressed by the respondents, the most desirable characteristics of such services were also explored.

In terms of child care, it was found that the majority of respondents report themselves as leaving their children with private babysitters and non-working family members. The major obstacles to use of child care centers were found to be distance away from the home and expense. If centers were accessible in terms of cost and location, the respondents reported they would leave their children either in the centers or with family. The most important characteristics of the centers were seen by respondents to be: multiservice facilities, including health care of a comprehensive and detailed nature; educational programs; cultural activities; and adequate recreation programs and facilities (see Tables 59A/B, 60, 61, 62, and 63).

Most respondents report themselves as responsible for paying for and acquiring health insurance. Most felt that health clinics do not have services available during non-working hours. Dental and ophthalmological care is in great demand, as are multiservice clinics where a broad spectrum of health services are provided, with greater flexibility in terms of the hours the clinics are open (see Tables 64, 65, 66, and 67).

Housing while working away from the home base is a major problem to the bulk of the respondents. Female respondents in both Fresno and Imperial report that the Central Valley is the most difficult area in California in which to find housing. The actual lack of housing facilities is the major obstacle, with cost being next in importance and the presence of children third in significance. More camp housing with better facilities within the camps, was requested (see Tables 68A/B, 69, 70, and 71).

These reported needs are neither surprising nor unreasonable. They reflect basic human requirements for adequate shelter, a modest level of health care, including attention to teeth and eyes, and a great concern for the well-being of their children while they are at work and unable to personally attend to their children's needs. As in most sociological studies of other populations, the concern for education of their children to insure them a better quality of life is high.

CHAPTER II

A COMPARISON OF SOCIAL SERVICES NEEDED WITH SOCIAL SERVICES PROVIDED

In this chapter the agency questionnaire responses will be discussed in relationship to the needs expressed by the women farmworker respondents. It is not our intention to formally evaluate, nor to criticize or commend any of the agencies involved, but merely to clarify differences between workers' expressed needs and available agency services.

Completed questionnaires were provided by the following agencies: California Department of Industrial Relations (including Cal/OSHA), the Comprehensive Employment Training Advisory Office (CETA-O), the Department of Health, the Department of Housing and Community Development, Migrant Services, and the Employment Development Department (EDD).

Only general comparisons between perceived needs and available services have been made, since farmworker responses, both male and female,^{1/} were quite specific, but the responses from agencies were of a more general nature. Despite this difference in the form of the responses, some conclusions may be drawn.

Workers' perceptions of health and safety hazards in agricultural employment, what in the workers' opinion might be done about these hazards, and the procedures followed by the Department of Industrial Relations in providing protection were elicited. In descending order of mention, women farmworkers cited as primary risks to their health and safety: mechanized processes (primarily conveyor-belt accidents and machine hazards around conveyor belts resulting from unsafe design or lack of proper upkeep), field conditions under which they are expected to work, unsafe use of chemicals, and lack of adequate sanitation facilities (see Table 72). In addition to detailed criticism of conditions, women farmworkers suggested steps that could be undertaken to reduce these risks. The following responses occurred with the most regularity: machines should be better maintained, with special safety devices regularly utilized; employers should discuss problems of field conditions with their workers to make them aware of potential danger areas; better safety procedures with respect to chemical use should be implemented; and laws and regulations should be more effectively enforced.

The responses of the Department of Industrial Relations indicate that there are adequate laws and regulations to protect workers from many of the perceived hazards. Yet, workers respond so strongly about the risks to which they are exposed that it is clear there is a wide gap between protective laws and any beneficial effects for farmworkers. The Department does not maintain personnel to deal specifically with agricultural concerns. The same personnel must deal with both industrial and agricultural safety, and attend to fair employment practices concerns as well. This agency response indicates that although they *may* initiate investigations or proceedings against violations, they most frequently respond to complaints; in other words the agency posture is essentially a passive one. Since the majority of complaints originate in industry, the industrial areas may be better served. The agency practice of proceeding on complaints, rather than initiating actions, appears to stem from shortness of staff rather than any lack of concern. Because farmworkers may not be as aware of their rights as are urban industrial workers, since information is often less available in rural areas, the policy of action via complaint rather than action through agency initiation without doubt contributes significantly to the workers' accurate perception that agricultural health and safety services are inadequate. The problems of lack of information, who should supply such information, and who should coordinate such information will be addressed in the conclusion of the chapter.

^{1/} Although this report is primarily concerned with women's expressed needs, the findings are that men and women share concerns for the same services.

The response received from the Department of Health, Farmworker Health Services Unit (FHSU), demonstrates why farmworkers overwhelmingly express a need for an increased level of health care services. There are only 12 FHSU clinics currently operating, although more are planned in the near future. However, there are significant gaps in health care service since the Department of Health estimates that they have a budget of only \$185,000 to serve an estimated farmworker population of 500,000. This works out to 37 cents per year per farmworker.

Clearly, not all farmworkers depend on FHSU for equal health care services. But it seems obvious that this woefully inadequate budget can only represent woefully inadequate service to this client population.

The Department of Health FHSU coordinates with local community agencies to some extent, and has undertaken research on effects of pesticides and accessibility of health care services to farmworkers. The FHSU is seeking effective ways of drawing input from farmworkers themselves. Their study on accessibility shows, expectedly, that distance from clinics and poor transportation facilities impede access to health care. There is also a lack of access to private practitioners, since many do not accept patients who are social benefit or MediCal recipients. Farmworkers themselves, as seen in responses presented here, would add the limited hours clinics are open as a barrier to access (see Table 66). In addition, since health services may be provided through the migrant housing camps, those farmworkers who cannot find housing at the migrant camps have still another barrier (see Table 68B). The farmworker respondents express a distinct and immediate need for dental and eye care.^{2/} They report a preference for multiservice health clinics, rather than purely primary care clinics. In addition, they express a need for bilingual professional medical staff (see Table 67).

Another area of concern to farmworkers is housing. Two entities within the California state governmental structure deal with the problems of farmworker housing: the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Migrant Services office of EDD. The Department of Housing and Community Development works with local farmworker agencies, such as county housing authorities, to provide cooperatively-owned housing, multifamily housing, and single-family home ownership. Since many of the organizations they work with are either farmworker community action agencies, or are agencies in touch with such groups, much of their information about housing needs comes from these sources. Like the Departments of Industrial Relations, and Health, and the offices of Migrant Services, and CETA, they obtain additional planning information about the farmworker population from the aggregate data provided by the Employment Development Department. HCD is concerned with finding adequate loan sources for farmworkers to buy their own homes, as well as adequate land resources for homes. Since many farmworker respondents indicated that they rent rather than own their homes, this seems to be highly appropriate work for HCD to undertake and pursue.

The Migrant Services office runs 25 migrant centers which provide temporary housing. Each center can accommodate 50 to 150 families, but the office did not provide information on the size of these dwellings in relationship to the size of the families. In addition, the office indicated that their camps are locally run in terms of services and facilities provided. In spite of Migrant Services' statement that they have two monthly meetings with committees of camp residents, women respondents in this study claimed not to participate in such meetings (see Table 74A). The reality of local input from the residents themselves may be open to question. Information about child care was not available from Migrant Services; project staff were referred to the State Department of Education. Migrant Services appears not to be in sufficient communication with the Department of Education to have an overview of services and facilities existing for children. However, it should be noted that most child care services at migrant centers are determined by local input. Although most interviewees responded that they would like to use child care centers, they do not use centers for the reasons of cost, location, and programs discussed in Chapter I. If these child care centers are

^{2/} FHSU reports show some eye and dental care for children, but it is unclear whether these services are provided for adults. Ophthalmological examinations are, of course, crucial, and the question of provision of eye glasses also requires attention.

available only to camp residents, and if there is inadequate accessibility to camp housing, then child care needs are clearly not being met numerically, and perhaps not in the form reported as desirable by respondents (see Table 63).

Farmworker respondents to the survey did not reflect substantial job placement through the Employment Development Department, nor was there a large percentage of participation in EDD programs such as the Work Incentive Program (WIN). EDD reports the migrant seasonal farmworker (MSFW) applications as being 66,911, with 30,518 being referred to jobs. Of these referrals 21,652 were to agricultural jobs, and EDD figures further show 16,085 placements in agricultural jobs. Although many farmworkers have been referred and placed through EDD, there must be a large population of farmworkers, since a representative sample of farmworkers does not reveal a high affirmative response rate with regard to EDD job referrals and placements. It is unfortunate that there is no accurate data on the total number of farmworkers, since this lack makes it impossible to tell whether EDD is serving a significant portion of the farmworker population or whether it serves only a fragment. The character of the placements which have been made deserves mention. The bulk of these farmworker placements are in jobs which are for longer than three days and less than 150 days. It seems likely, then, that these placements occur during peak of season and probably last only about two to three weeks. The farmworker survey responses may be a reflection of the low rate of job placements which they report as gaining through EDD.

More critical of EDD than the farmworker respondents, however, were the grower respondents. Many growers reported they they made no effort to work through EDD, based on their prior experience with the agency. Their major criticism was of the time lag between a request for employees and the referral of farmworkers to them for employment, particularly during peak of season. If the majority of growers were to become disenchanted with EDD, this would impact upon farmworkers in that EDD would not have the job listings for placements (see Tables 74B, 74C, and 74D).

CONCLUSION

Migrant Services does make an excellent point: there is no single agency structuring and coordinating farmworker programs. Thus, the information about the nature of these programs may be somewhat confusing to the public. It is surely confusing to farmworkers, and perhaps this is why many of their expressed needs are unmet. Increased services to the farmworker population are obviously important, but what is also clearly necessary are effective methods of information dissemination to notify farmworkers of existing services and programs. Improved channels of communication will help alleviate the lack of access to programs.

Problems in communication are in some respects clearly illustrated by the State CETA office response. CETA itself does not provide services, but does fund innovative and demonstration programs. They coordinate with numerous agencies and groups working with farmworkers. There are also CETA prime sponsors in various counties, but the prime sponsors are autonomous, and in order to coordinate or learn of their activities, each would have to be contacted.

There are serious gaps between the needs expressed by farmworker respondents and the provision of services by agencies. The responses of both farmworkers and agencies indicate that this is primarily due to a lack of a comprehensive, coordinated planning and implementation structure, a lack of avenues to adequately promote farmworker input and participation, and a lack of comprehensive and detailed information about the numbers, needs, and characteristics of the farmworkers themselves. It is to be hoped that the data base presented by this study will be helpful to those agencies seeking to serve an isolated and disparate farmworker client group.

CHAPTER III

A COMPARISON OF EMPLOYMENT SITUATIONS AND OPTIONS FOR WOMEN AND MEN

This study did not begin from the assumption that women workers are discriminated against on the basis of gender. Rather the study undertook to explore potential areas of difference between the characteristics of employment for male and female farmworkers. Comparisons of the following areas were made:

1. Tasks performed
2. Length of time employed during the year
3. Income differentials
4. Perceptions of women's work ability
5. Perceived obstacles to employment
6. Preferred areas for change of employment.

By far the majority of women respondents reported themselves as performing the tasks of weeding, thinning, hoeing and harvesting. These tasks are in contrast to the activities performed by men, which include not only these tasks but irrigating and driving as well (see Table 44). Although growers report that they pay men and women at the same rate for the same tasks, and farmworkers themselves support this claim (see Table 75), it was hypothesized that women, being confined to what the industry labels low-level tasks,^{1/} would have lower incomes. Keeping women in these tasks, with no upward job mobility and with lower incomes, would result in a diminished standard of living for women. This would be of particularly serious significance to women heads of household. Also, the types of tasks performed will affect the amount of time employable during the year. The hoeing, weeding and thinning tasks women perform, which take a comparatively short time to do and are done only at certain periods, may result in lower pay and underemployment.

The issue of underemployment required an examination of the length of time women work during the year as compared to the length of time men work during the year. Table 76 shows the responses about the average number of weeks respondents generally expect to be employed during the year. The table holds years of experience and years of education constant, so that the difference in amount of time employed can be clearly associated with sex rather than being attributed to any intervening variable.

This table shows that no matter how much experience and education women have, men with the same degree of experience and education will be employed a higher average of weeks in the year. A regression analysis was run for this table and resulted in the probability of 0.0001. This means that there is only a one in ten thousand probability that this finding could occur by chance alone.

The next area of comparison in employment characteristics between men and women was their respective incomes. Tables 77 and 78 show the average annual and weekly incomes for male and female farmworkers. All these tables are consistent in that they show men and women with the same years of experience and years of education; they also consistently show that men earn more than women. In fact, some categories of men have incomes which are two to three times those of some categories of women. These incomes reflect only those wages earned in agriculture. This evidence supports the perception that although men work more than women, they do not work so much more that it can account for a difference of two or three times greater income for males.

^{1/}Those tasks which are less well paid than activities such as irrigation or machine operation reflect the low status assigned them by the industry.

Since growers report that they pay the same wages for the same tasks, this income difference must be due to the fact that although they are paid the same for the same jobs, women more frequently perform low-status, low-paying jobs. This is particularly held true by the finding of Table 44. When asked if in their opinion women earn as much as men when the men and women are performing the same tasks, most respondents agreed with the growers' expression of their belief that there is equal pay for equal tasks. The only respondents who did not agree, and this is significant if not surprising, were women farmworkers with high education and high experience. Again, regressions were performed to test the degree of significance and probability of the income findings, and were found to range between 0.0001 and 0.0003. This, then, means that there is only between a one in ten thousand to a three in ten thousand likelihood that these findings about income differences could occur by chance alone. Tables 79 and 80 further illustrate the difference in incomes for men and women farmworkers. When using an average annual income figure calculated from all worker responses, and when keeping years of education constant, women more often than men earn less than that average income figure. The same held true when examining the average weekly income. Regression was performed and results found to be, again, statistically significant.

The responses of the women farmworker interviewees indicate that they:

1. Feel able to do the same tasks (machine operation, irrigation) as men, but that they lack training (see Table 81).
2. Are capable and prepared to do the same work as men but they are not hired to do this work (see Table 82).

These perceptions add support to the argument that women could do the same work as men, and thus earn higher incomes, but that they are either denied training to move up to these jobs or are not hired to do these jobs, regardless of the amount of education and experience they have. In addition, in Table 83 it can be seen that men and women respondents agree that women *are* able to do the same work as men.

When men and women were asked if they would like to work in an occupation other than agriculture if they learned new skills, they overwhelmingly agreed. However, they also agreed that if conditions were improved, more would remain in agriculture. Although men and women agree that lack of education and job training are the main obstacles to changing employment, women more frequently than men cited familial responsibilities and child care as being additional obstacles, while men cited language difficulties more frequently than did women (see Tables 58, 84 and 85). When asked about preferred occupational sectors other than agriculture, Table 33 shows women having a preference for white-collar and helping occupations and men showing a preference for blue-collar work.

It is possible to see that in agriculture, as in other employment sectors, females more consistently perform low-status, low-paying tasks, and are more burdened by familial duties than men when considering alternative careers in other occupational sectors.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT

The growers who were interviewed were primarily sole proprietors, growing grapes, lettuce, field and vegetable crops, and tree fruits. Half of the grower interviewees farmed under 640 acres. The largest number of growers had been farming for between thirty and forty years; seventeen growers leased land, while twenty-three leased no land but owned the entirety. Twenty-one of the grower respondents had between one and four other family members engaged in the operation with them, even if not in a formalized partnership. There were, of course, differences between counties. For example, larger land holdings were primarily located in Imperial, and more Fresno farmers leased part of the land they farm (see Tables 86, 87, 88 and 89).

Although this sample is too small to be statistically representative, it is possible to discuss the indications of employer's attitudes toward women farmworker employees, particularly since those employers who were interviewed were quite consistent in their responses to the attitudinal portion of the interview schedule.

For example, although 32 growers agreed with the statement that women workers are as dependable as male workers, and some qualified this response to say that they felt women workers were more dependable, they also felt women workers were not physically able to perform the same work as men. This is a central issue. It may or may not be true that women are able to perform the same tasks as men, based on physical strength; it would be more correct to say that some women *and* some men are not able to perform physically rigorous tasks. Under Civil Rights law and Equal Employment Opportunity regulations, women must be given the opportunity to compete for virtually any type of work a man would be hired to do. Thus, decisions not to hire women as machine operators because they may have to hook heavy equipment to tractors, which may be too physically taxing, may be neither valid nor legally correct. Most growers felt that women could be trained to do the same tasks as men (within their physical limitations), that women were equally cooperative as employees, that men and women equally deserve agricultural job training (when this was favored at all), that men and women are equally productive when doing the same tasks, and that women are hard workers (see Tables 90A/B, 91, 92, 93, 94A/B, 95, and 96). However, they prefer not to hire women to operate machinery, resulting in relegating women to low-level tasks and, therefore, lower-paying tasks (see Chapter III). In addition, grower responses indicate that they believe women to be less skilled than men (Table 97A/B). Yet skills can be acquired, and comparatively few depend on a high level of physical strength.

In the open-ended response part of the interview schedule, growers were asked to comment on their perceptions of the industry and the future of the industry. Among the items they mentioned as important and significant to agriculture in the future were: the need for more pesticide research, since more effective and less harmful pesticides would have significant advantages; a need for less government intervention in labor relations and other areas of agricultural production; and difficulties engendered by the enforcement of the 160-acre limitation. Only Fresno growers discussed labor supply problems. In both counties growers were asked to comment on their view of mechanization in agriculture. Most felt that if there is an increase in mechanized harvesting, they would very likely employ women in the mechanized harvest procedures. This is not meant to imply that no growers expressed reservations about agricultural mechanization; but with mechanization, if it were to occur, there would be, in their minds, less of a barrier to women's employment, since they felt that mechanization reduces the physical rigorousness of the work.

PROJECTION FOR FUTURE STUDY

It is possible to surmise that with mechanization and the growers' perception that physical rigor is reduced with mechanization, employment opportunities may increase for women farmworkers.

Also, it is quite clear that growers feel that government regulation and intervention is an onerous burden.^{1/} However, it was also found that most growers believe that if social services are to be provided to farmworkers, these services should be government sponsored (see Table 98C). Growers also believe that they are businessmen, and as such they will only be in business as long as they can make a living. Thus, although they may comply with, for example, sanitation regulations to some extent, they are not prepared, nor perhaps in some cases able, to provide them to the full extent of the law if it cannot be cost/benefit balanced.

These are not necessarily unreasonable attitudes and perceptions. In fact, many of them are quite understandable. When compared with the farmworkers' attitudes towards agricultural work, however, real conflicts which may have serious implications can be seen to surface. As already shown (see Chapter I), women farmworkers are not interested in remaining in agriculture unless conditions improve. Thus, if mechanization were to become prevalent, and women were to become preferred employees, they might not be available unless conditions such as the following are met: better pay and benefits, better housing facilities, better working conditions, and better treatment by employers and supervisors. In terms of regulations and enforcement of health and safety laws, if women want improvement in this area and consequently begin to make complaints, there will be government intervention, and this intervention is a sensitive area to the growers. In addition, if, as this study shows, farmworkers are intent on occupations other than farmwork for themselves, if possible, and certainly for their children (see Tables 98A/B and 99), then there may be a decrease in the total number of agricultural workers (not at once, but over time) unless replenished from new sources. If working conditions in agriculture are not made better by the employers themselves, there may not be an adequate labor force, or there may be considerable government intervention on behalf of the labor force, or there may be both. Basic economics would seem to indicate that smaller farmers would be the first to feel these ill effects. It is the small farmer that depends on recurrent labor to meet his/her labor needs, it is the small grower who is less likely to mechanize and thus has higher labor requirements, and it is the small grower who feels most suffocated by government intervention and its accompanying paperwork. Thus, these projected factors may impact upon the already prevalent trend in California toward agribusiness corporation control of food production. There is no value judgment implied here; rather, by suggesting these projections, it is hoped that potentially affected individuals, including growers, will make conscious decisions.

The picture projected is not totally grim. There are a number of characteristics of agricultural work that are very appealing to many women farmworkers. For example, women like working outside in the open, the freedom of working some seasons and not the entire year, and the freedom of agricultural work when contrasted to work for a tightly supervised and organized industry (see Table 100). In fact, women specifically like those aspects of agricultural work that are less industrialized. Thus, if agriculture is increasingly industrialized, without improving working conditions, it is logical to project that women will be less interested in agriculture as an occupation, even if it is more available. It is important to note, however, that a shift to the industrial mechanized mode may not be the solution to a potentially diminishing labor force. For example, energy reserves are of considerable importance, given the current and continued scarcity of energy resources. To disrupt the agricultural labor force in favor of mechanized processes, which may not have adequate fuel resources, could result in a severe lack of labor should it be necessary to resume hand farm labor. It should also be noted that a rapid transition to mechanization will displace workers who currently have no other career options and will have to undergo training to be employable in another sector. Further, it is important to remember that those farmworkers who have worked with machines prefer to work without machines, and that machines are perceived as a primary risk to safety.

These projections, of course, are not meant to be conclusive; but, instead, they are meant to be indicative of potential situations for both the farmworkers and growers of the California agricultural production system.

^{1/} It must be pointed out that several growers expressed their belief that their own lack of organization and in some areas lack of responsibility had contributed to an increased governmental role in agriculture, and that they realized their social responsibilities.

CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

This is the first descriptive demographic study of women farmworkers to have been conducted in California, as well as the first study nationwide to deal specifically with women farmworkers as differentiated from male farmworkers, or from the farmworkers population as a whole. The aim of the study was to obtain as full a profile as possible of women employed in agricultural farmwork in California.

A combination of sociological methods was used to achieve this goal while maintaining a high level of confidence in the findings. The use of multiple methods is valuable in this regard as it allows for different questions and concerns to be addressed in the manner which will result in the most appropriate mode of response. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed, as were archival, in-depth interview, and survey research. In addition, although the target population was specifically female farmworkers, male farmworkers, agricultural employers, and State agencies involved in farmworker issues and support services were used as respondents so that a full view of women farmworkers and their social context could be developed.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

The first step was a literature search to determine what was currently known about female farmworkers, and to determine which of the State of California agencies were most involved in service delivery to the farmworker population. Using subject headings such as farmworker, migrant, agricultural labor, seasonal labor, agriculture, Chicana, Mexicana, and Mexican-American, a number of libraries and indexes were searched. The California State Library was searched, using not only the subject headings listed above, but was searched agency by agency to see which agencies had published reports on farmworkers or had services to farmworkers discussed in their annual reports. The agencies concerned with farmworkers which emerged from this search were as follows: Migrant Services/Migrant Education, Employment Development Department, Department of Health, Office of Migrant Rural Programs, Department of Housing and Community Development, and the program section of the State Comprehensive Employment and Training Act office located within the Department of Employment Development. Conspicuously absent from the list, since there were no reports, were Cal/OSHA, and with the exception of one report, the Department of Industrial Relations. The Department of Agriculture, although keeping statistical reports on numbers of farmworkers, had no other information; farmworkers and farmworker services are not really within their mandate. Consequently, this department has been excluded from the questionnaire developed from distribution to State agencies mandated to work with farmworkers. Having located the agencies to be used as respondents, their annual reports were read and questionnaires developed specific to each agency's farmworker-related programs (see section on agency questionnaires).

As can be seen from the partial bibliography, little useful information about the California farm labor force existed, and there was even less on women farmworkers alone. Agriculture as an industry in California emerged as not even differentiating between numbers of males and numbers of females employed. Data from EDD and the Department of Food and Agriculture were found to be based not on actual numbers of labor force participants, but on mathematical formulas which estimate the number of jobs and the number of manhours. Thus, it was dubious that these data were reliable or informative, and it was decided that both males and females needed to be interviewed so that the necessary comparisons could be made from a data base with greater reliability.

Having completed the literature search of state-related sources, the libraries at the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of California, Davis, were searched. In addition to searching the collections of these libraries, Dissertation Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts, the automated Cain data base, and a number of periodical indexes were searched. Again, very little information specific to women farmworkers could be discovered.

SURVEY LOCATIONS

Examination of the California agricultural industry did lead to a choice of counties for the survey: Fresno and Imperial. Given the constraints of a one-year project, the study was limited to two counties. Consequently, counties which were representative of various elements in California agriculture were sought. Fresno and Imperial are both counties in which the agricultural industry plays a prominent role. They provide complementary information since the organization of agricultural labor and agricultural production differs in each.

Fresno has a highly diversified base of agricultural commodities. Thus, there is a more stable labor force, primarily seasonal rather than migrant, and a broad range of tasks for agricultural workers exists. The variety of crops and tasks insures a greater likelihood of employment for a greater portion of the year. Imperial County is somewhat less diversified in terms of crops with labor-intensive activities. In addition, due to its proximity to the border, the labor force has a greater portion of workers commuting from Mexicali, and a greater portion of migrant workers who move through the Imperial and Coachella valleys.

FARMWORKER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Using the little information found in the literature search, a set of questions that could be used for social histories with male and female farmworkers was derived. In this more qualitative component of the study, open-ended oral histories were conducted with male and female farmworkers. These interviews served to supplement the available literature in developing a base for the formulation of the farmworker interview schedule questions. In addition, questions were drawn from Cheryl Peterson's 1965 USDA-sponsored farmworker study, so that there would be a potential for comparative overtime analysis.

The farmworker interview schedule consisted of primarily closed-ended questions, supplemented by open-ended and attitudinal questions. The interview schedules were pre-coded. The interview schedules were in both English and Spanish, so that the respondents could participate in the interview using their own language of choice. The interview schedule underwent "back translation." This means that the interview schedule which was developed in English, was translated into Spanish, and then, by a second translator, translated back into English to see if the translation expressed the English formulations adequately. The interview schedule was then pretested by six respondents; examined by the Advisory Board, particularly those members with agricultural backgrounds; examined by several consulting sociologists with methodological expertise; and discussed with persons familiar with the farmworker experience.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYER INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

In-depth open-ended interviews conducted in 1975 & 1978,^{1/} were used as the basis for the agricultural employer interview schedules. Closed-ended, open-ended, and attitudinal questions on the agricultural employer interview schedule for the *Campesina* study were based upon the earlier interviews with growers and on social histories from farmworkers showing the need for work context information. The interview schedules were designed to determine agricultural employers' attitudes toward employing women in general and toward employing women for specific tasks, and to obtain information bearing on production which will affect employment contexts.

^{1/} Interviews conducted in the preparation of *Destalking the Wily Tomato*, Friedland and Barton, 1975 and *Manufacturing Green Gold* Friedland, Barton, and Thomas, 1978

After completion of the interview schedule, it was reviewed by several sociologists, the Advisory Board, particularly the agricultural employer members, and agricultural industry representatives.

AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

As discussed earlier, materials specific to the target agencies were collected and reviewed. The questionnaires were designed to be self-administered by the agency heads so that both policy and specifics of the programs relating to farmworkers could be explored. Again, the farmworker social histories were used to highlight certain areas of the agency questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed to be open-ended. Both quantitative information, such as number of clients served, and qualitative information, such as type and depth of service, were elicited. Again, the instrument was reviewed by sociologists, the Advisory Board, and persons familiar with social service programs and social service program delivery.

FARMWORKER SAMPLE

Given the lack of accurate data on the numbers of farmworkers in California, it was difficult to determine a sample size. The universe was defined as infinite, and the sample size of 600 was selected from the Appendix table. The sample size of 600, according to the table, allows for generalizability reliable within ± 4 percent. The total sample of 600 was broken down into components of 400 women, a sample reliable within ± 5 percent, and 200 men, a sample reliable within ± 7 percent. This breakdown was decided upon since some interviews with males were needed for comparative purposes, but a larger number of females was appropriate since they are the target of the study.

Originally, the farmworker sample was to be drawn through employers. Through employee lists, random samples were to be drawn and the workers contacted and interviewed in their homes. However, in both counties, agricultural employers were either unable or unwilling to comply with the requests for lists of workers. Those agricultural employers who were able to comply did not provide adequate breadth in terms of type of growing operation, since they were all small growers and involved in essentially the same crops. This would have biased the type of workers interviewed. Consequently, an alternative sampling framework was created.

In Fresno, County Planning Department maps were utilized. First, using the County Planning Department definitions, the county was divided into four quadrants: north, south, east, and west. Then, using Fresno County census data, residential sections of the county were further broken down by ethnicity and by incorporated and unincorporated areas. Using the concept of key informants, state and county outreach workers and farmworker community informants identified those residential areas within the census tracts where farmworkers were located. A list of public and private farmworker housing camps was then obtained from the Fresno County Department of Environmental Health, and the two lists were scrambled and combined. These areas were then randomly sampled and a list of areas for the survey resulted. Streets within these areas were then randomly sampled to provide the interviewer assignments. A random numbers table was used to assign different interviewers to different 'nth' houses on the streets.

In Imperial County, the sample of 300 was split into two groups of 150, one hundred women and fifty men to each group. Group A interviewees were located by using the same procedure as had been developed in Fresno and consisted of farmworkers living on the United States side of the border. Group B were residents of Mexico. These workers were contacted as they crossed the border in the early morning hours. Every third woman and every fifth man was approached, and addresses in Mexicali were obtained from those agreeing to do interviews. Where workers travelled across the border in groups, every third group was approached and a coin was flipped to determine which worker would be asked to participate.^{2/}

^{2/} This form of sampling may somewhat reduce the percent of reliability as indicated by the chart in the Appendix. The large overall sample size allows for considerable confidence in the overall findings, despite the possible increase in sampling error for the 150 Mexican residents.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS SAMPLE

The Agricultural Commissioners in Fresno and Imperial Counties were contacted and were requested to provide a representative list of agricultural employers in their counties. The Fresno County list provided information on farm size and crops grown, which are important variables for the sample to be representative. This list was randomly sampled and growers were contacted until a sample of twenty interviews had been developed. The Imperial list of growers was not stratified by farm size and crop. After the sample had been drawn and interviews conducted, key informants of the Imperial agricultural industry were contacted and asked a list of questions synthesized from the responses obtained from the sample, as a check for representativeness of the county as a whole. These samples do not have statistical reliability of generalization, but do serve to give an indication of prevailing attitudes toward, and work context for, farmworkers in these counties.

SELECTION AND TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

Interviewers were recruited locally in Fresno and Imperial counties. Job announcements for these positions were circulated in a variety of places one month prior to hiring: Employment Development Department offices, farmworker social service agencies, local legislative offices, and others. Given the residential nature of the sampling and location of farmworkers, it was important to have interviewers familiar with the local areas. Thoroughly bilingual persons with previous experience with interviewing and with farmworkers were selected. In each county 14 women and 6 men were hired as interviewers. Male interviewers interviewed men and female interviewers interviewed women. This procedure was considered necessary, since cultural differences might have prevented women interviewees from responding openly, or even participating in interviews with men. Interviewers were trained at one-day training sessions directed toward general interview techniques and familiarization with the interview schedules. In addition, interviewers were trained in terms of the administrative requirements for invoices and information release forms, since interviewees were compensated for their time, and had to sign legal releases. Techniques used in the training session involved small group discussion of the interview schedules, role playing while using the interview schedules, and large group questions and answers. Interviewers translated Spanish open-ended responses into appropriate English keywords.

FRESNO INTERVIEWS

The Fresno interviews were conducted in early September 1977, during the peak labor period for that county, and lasted two weeks. Interviewers were required to check in every two days. Invoices for the interviewees were randomly sampled to provide the names and addresses of respondents for check-back purposes. Aside from this procedure to establish the validity of the interviews, strict confidentiality of the interviewee identities was maintained.

Grower interviews were conducted during November, after the peak harvest pressure was somewhat eased.

IMPERIAL INTERVIEWS

Imperial farmworker interviews were conducted in January 1978, during the peak labor period and lasted two weeks. The same check-in and check-back procedures that applied in Fresno were again utilized.

Grower interviews were conducted in December 1977.

DATA PROCESSING

Data entry and processing were contracted to the Division of Social Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz. The Social Sciences Division maintains a full-time staff to facilitate social scientists' computer needs. This, plus the capacity of the system for direct data entry onto disc were considered valuable characteristics. The physical components plus specialized programming staff allowed the study's vast quantity of data to be handled efficiently, yet without losing any of the subtleties and nuances in some of the responses. Only farmworker interviews, 300 from Fresno and 286 from Imperial,^{3/} and agricultural employer interviews, 20 from Fresno and 20 from Imperial, were entered into the computing system. Agency questionnaires were not manipulated by computer since they were few in number and very specific in design.

Open-ended responses from the farmworker and agricultural employer interview schedules were input by keyword and keyword phrase directly into the computer. From this procedure it was possible to get listings of frequency response for coding purposes. This is different from the procedure of creating coding categories first and then entering coded responses, and worked very well in that the codes are derived from the actual responses and all of the responses still exist for in-depth discussion and examples.

The first step in handling the entered closed-ended responses was to obtain frequencies both by county and then with both counties combined. Following these frequency distributions, crosstabs by sex were run for all of the questions, both closed-ended and open-ended. These steps were also followed for the grower interviewer schedules, but without crosstabs by sex, since all growers in the samples were male.

The entering of the open-ended questions, as well as the closed-ended questions, was programmed to allow for multiple responses where necessary and appropriate in terms of obtaining the fullest possible answer from the farmworkers and agricultural employers. This results in considerable variation in the missing values of the tables.

Using the frequencies and crosstabs, several new variables were created, and control variables were identified and defined. Control variables were identified as being race, number of years of formal education (high education = 9 years and more), and number of years of farmwork experience (high experience = 10 years and more). New variables include: migrant (five weeks and more away from home, with "home" defined as place of permanent residence) and non-migrant (fewer than five weeks away from home); average annual income; average rate of pay per task; weeks worked during the year; and average weekly income.

Based on the above, tables were ordered in such a way as to test the relationship between the independent variable (sex) and a number of dependent variables in a series of 68 hypotheses pertaining to the status of women farmworkers. Only these tables relating to those hypotheses with direct bearing and statistical significance, as determined through regression analysis techniques, are included in this report.

^{3/} Fourteen female farmworker interview schedules were lost in the mail from Imperial to Santa Cruz. This alters the percentage of reliability by 1%, i.e. $\pm 6\%$ and $\pm 8\%$.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	Ethnic Background
TABLE 2	Age
TABLE 3	Religion
TABLE 4	Marital Status
TABLE 5	Household Status
TABLE 6	Citizenship Status
TABLE 7	Years of Education
TABLE 8	Languages Read
TABLE 9	Languages Written
TABLE 10	Language in Which Interview was Conducted
TABLE 11	Place of Education
TABLE 12	Home Base Location
TABLE 13	Declares a Home Base Location
TABLE 14	Type of Home Base Housing
TABLE 15	Home Ownership
TABLE 16	Number of Rooms in Residence
TABLE 17A	Separate Kitchen
TABLE 17B	Separate Bathroom
TABLE 18A	Number of Persons at Home Base Unit
TABLE 18B	Number of Persons Sharing Residence
TABLE 19	Number of Wage Earners in Family
TABLE 20	Number of Dependents in Family
TABLE 21	Length of Time in Current Residence
TABLE 22	Total Family Income Earned in California
TABLE 23	Amount of Annual Income Earned in Agriculture
TABLE 24	Pay U.S. Income Tax
TABLE 25	Usual Weekly Earnings
TABLE 26	Earnings in Past Two Weeks
TABLE 27	Contribution to Annual Family Income
TABLE 28	Sources of Assistance When Not Working
TABLE 29	Generations Family has Worked in Agriculture
TABLE 30	Family Participation in Non-Agricultural Work
TABLE 31	Type of Non-Agricultural Work Performed by Family
TABLE 32	Number of Years in Farmwork
TABLE 33	Preferred Non-Agricultural Occupation
TABLE 34	Number of Employers in a Year
TABLE 35	Number of Weeks Away From Home Base to Work in Agriculture
TABLE 36	Type of Transportation to Work
TABLE 37	Number of Family Members Travelling to Work with Respondent
TABLE 38	Relationship of Travelling Family Members
TABLE 39	Season Most Fully Employed
TABLE 40	Weeks Worked in Summer
TABLE 41	Weeks Worked in Winter
TABLE 42	Major Crops Worked In
TABLE 43	Crops Worked in Longest

TABLE 44	Types of Tasks Most Frequently Performed
TABLE 45	Prefer Piece or Hourly Rate
TABLE 46	Crops Worked in Affected by Mechanization
TABLE 47	Mechanization — Effects on Jobs
TABLE 48	Types of Machine-Related Jobs Performed
TABLE 49	Prefer Work With or Without Machines
TABLE 50	Ever Belong to a Union
TABLE 51	Prefer to Have a Union Represent Interests with Employer
TABLE 52	If Belong to a Union, Does Union Represent Interests
TABLE 53	Been Referred to a Job Training Program
TABLE 54	Heard of Any Job Training Program Interesting to You
TABLE 55	Attended a Job Training Program in California
TABLE 56	Helped by That Job Training Program
TABLE 57	Wish to Pursue a Non-Agricultural Occupation
TABLE 58	Prefer Agricultural Employment to Non-Agricultural Employment If Conditions Improve
TABLE 59A	Forms of Child Care
TABLE 59B	Preferred Forms of Child Care
TABLE 60	Leave Children in Center at Some Distance
TABLE 61	Use Center if Affordable
TABLE 62	Use Center if Close By
TABLE 63	Preferred Child Care Center Characteristics
TABLE 64	Party Responsible for Provision of Health Care
TABLE 65	Health Insurance Available at Place of Employment
TABLE 66	Health Service Available During Non-Working Hours
TABLE 67	Preferred Health Care Services and Characteristics
TABLE 68A	Housing Available When Away From Home
TABLE 68B	Available Housing Usually in Migrant Camp
TABLE 69	Problems in Locating Housing (Areas)
TABLE 70	Problems in Obtaining Housing (Obstacles)
TABLE 71	Need More Migrant Camp Housing
TABLE 72	Risks to Health and Safety at Work
TABLE 73	How to Reduce Risks to Health and Safety
TABLE 74A	Participation in Camp Meetings
TABLE 74B	Job Ever Obtained Through EDD
TABLE 74C	Ever Used EDD Services
TABLE 74D	EDD Services Most Used
TABLE 75	Women Paid as Much as Men for Same Jobs
TABLE 76	Average Number of Weeks Worked Per Year
TABLE 77	Annual Income
TABLE 78	Weekly Income
TABLE 79	Average Weekly Income
TABLE 80	Average Annual Income
TABLE 81	Women Able But Lack Training
TABLE 82	Women Can do Same Work as Men but are not Hired
TABLE 83	Women Able to do Same Work as Men
TABLE 84	Would Leave Agricultural Employment if Retraining Available

TABLE 85	Obstacles to Changing Occupations
TABLE 86	Crops Grown During Year
TABLE 87	Number of Acres Owned
TABLE 88	Years in Farming
TABLE 89	Which Best Describes Farm
TABLE 90A	Women as Dependable as Men
TABLE 90B	Women Physically as Able as Men
TABLE 91	Hire Women to Operate Machinery
TABLE 92	Within Physical Limitations Women can be Trained to do Same Tasks as Men
TABLE 93	Men More Cooperative Than Women
TABLE 94A	Job Training Good for Women
TABLE 94B	Job Training Good for Men
TABLE 95	Women are as Productive as Men
TABLE 96	Women are Hard Workers
TABLE 97A	Seasonal Jobs for Men
TABLE 97B	Seasonal Jobs for Women
TABLE 98A	Agricultural Problem Areas Most Important to Change
TABLE 98B	How to Change Agricultural Problem Areas
TABLE 98C	Government Should Provide Services
TABLE 99	Farmwork Adequate for Self but not Children
TABLE 100	Best Characteristics of Farmwork

TABLE 1 - ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	ANGLO		BLACK		MEXICAN		MEXICAN AMERICAN		FILIPINO		OTHER ASIAN		AMERICAN INDIAN		OTHER UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	5	2.5	5	2.5	94	47.4	87	43.9	2	1			1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5
MALE FRESNO			2	2	64	64	24	24			3	3					1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL			3	1.5	149	77.2	39	20.2	1	0.5							1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL			2	2.1	78	83.8	12	12.9									1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	5	1.2	8	2	243	62.1	126	32.2	3	0.7			1	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.5
TOTAL MALE			4	2	142	73.5	36	18.6			3	1.5					2	1
GRAND TOTAL	5	0.8	12	2	385	65.9	162	27.7	3	0.5	3	0.5	1	0.1	1	0.1	4	0.6

TABLE 2 - AGE

	1 - 15		16 - 20		21 - 29		30 - 39		40 - 49		50 - 55		56+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	3	1.5	32	16.1	46	23.2	56	28.2	44	22.2	12	6	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	1	1	6	6	32	32	23	23	19	19	12	12	7	7
FEMALE IMPERIAL	1	0.5	18	9.3	54	27.9	38	19.6	54	27.9	15	7.7	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	1	1	2	2.1	18	19.3	13	13.9	25	26.8	13	13.9	21	22.5
TOTAL FEMALE	4	1	50	12.7	100	25.5	94	24	98	25	27	6.9	17	4.3
TOTAL MALE	2	1	8	4.1	50	25.9	36	18.6	44	22.7	25	12.9	28	14.5
GRAND TOTAL	6	1	58	9.9	150	25.6	130	22.2	142	24.3	52	8.9	45	7.7

TABLE 3 - RELIGION

	CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		JEWISH		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	161	81.3	18	9	1	0.5	8	4	2	1	8	4
MALE FRESNO	77	77	6	6			9	9	2	2	6	6
FEMALE IMPERIAL	175	90.6	3	1.5			9	4.6	3	1.5	3	1.5
MALE IMPERIAL	85	91.3	1	1			4	4.3	1	1	1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	336	85.9	21	5.3	1	0.2	17	4.3	5	1.2	11	2.8
TOTAL MALE	162	83.9	7	3.6			13	6.7	3	1.5	7	3.6
GRAND TOTAL	498	85.2	28	4.7	1	0.1	30	5.1	8	1.3	18	3

TABLE 4 - MARITAL STATUS

	MARRIED		DIVORCED		SEPARATED		WIDOWED		SINGLE		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	148	74.7	11	5.5	6	3	7	3.5	22	11.1			4	2
MALE FRESNO	75	75	3	3					22	22				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	131	67.8	11	5.6	9	4.6	13	6.7	28	14.5	1	0.5		
MALE IMPERIAL	77	82.7	3	3.2	3	3.2			8	8.6			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	279	71.3	22	5.6	15	3.8	20	5.1	50	12.7	1	0.2	4	1
TOTAL MALE	152	78.7	6	3.1	3	1.5			30	15.5			2	1
GRAND TOTAL	431	73.8	28	4.7	18	3	20	3.4	80	13.6	1	0.1	6	1

TABLE 5 - HOUSEHOLD STATUS

	HEAD		WITH OTHERS		ALONE		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	44	22.2	149	75.2	4	2			1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	71	71	19	19	10	10				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	89	46.1	96	49.7	6	3.1			1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL	73	78.4	8	8.6	9	9.6	1	1	2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	133	34	245	62.6	10	2.5			2	0.5
TOTAL MALE	144	74.6	27	13.9	19	9.8	1	0.5	2	1
GRAND TOTAL	277	47.4	272	46.5	29	4.9	1	0.1	4	0.6

TABLE 6 - CITIZENSHIP STATUS

	YES		NO		PENDING		WORK VISA		GREEN CARD		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	118	59.5	49	24.7			2	1	26	13.1	1	0.5	2	1
MALE FRESNO	49	49	27	26.9	2	2	2	2	16	16			3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	55	28.4	46	23.8			4	2	87	45			1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL	25	26.8	28	30.1			2	2.1	38	40.8				
TOTAL FEMALE	173	44.2	95	24.2			6	1.5	113	28.9	1	0.2	3	0.7
TOTAL MALE	74	38.3	55	28.4	2	1	4	2	54	27.9			3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	247	42.2	150	25.6	2	0.3	10	1.7	167	28.5	1	0.1	6	1

TABLE 7 — YEARS OF EDUCATION

	NONE		IN SCHOOL		1-7 YEARS		8 YEARS		9-11 YEARS		12+ YEARS		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	16	8	10	5	75	37.8	22	11.1	46	23.2	28	14.1			1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	8	8	2	2	44	44	7	7	17	17	20	20			2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	22	11.3	12	6.2	108	55.9	14	7.2	20	10.3	16	8.2			1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL	13	13.9	1	1	56	60.2	5	5.3	11	11.8	5	5.3	1	1	1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	38	9.7	22	5.6	183	46.8	36	9.2	66	16.8	44	11.2			2	0.5
TOTAL MALE	21	10.8	3	1.5	100	51.8	12	6.2	28	14.5	25	12.9	1	0.5	3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	59	10.1	25	4.2	283	48.4	48	8.2	94	16	69	11.8	1	0.1	5	0.8

TABLE 8 — LANGUAGES READ

	ENGLISH		SPANISH		ENGLISH/ SPANISH		ENGLISH/ OTHER		OTHER		CAN'T READ		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	43	21.7	66	33.3	83	41.9					5	2.5			1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	13	13	49	49	34	34	1	1			3	3				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	4	2	131	67.8	50	25.9					7	3.6			1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.3	65	69.8	20	21.5					2	2.1			1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	47	12	197	50.3	133	34					12	3			2	0.5
TOTAL MALE	18	9.3	114	59	54	27.9	1	0.5			5	2.5			1	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	65	11.1	311	53.2	187	32	1	0.1			17	2.9			3	0.5

TABLE 9 — LANGUAGES WRITTEN

	ENGLISH		SPANISH		ENGLISH/ SPANISH		ENGLISH/ OTHER		OTHER		CAN'T WRITE		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	58	29.2	70	35.3	62	31.3					7	3.5			1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	20	20	51	50.9	22	22	1	1			6	6				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	7	3.6	132	68.3	45	23.3					8	4.1			1	0.5
MALE IMPERIAL	7	7.5	68	73.1	16	17.2					2	2.1				
TOTAL FEMALE	65	16.6	202	51.6	107	27.3					15	3.8			2	0.5
TOTAL MALE	27	13.9	119	61.6	38	19.6	1	0.5			8	4.1				
GRAND TOTAL	92	15.7	321	54.9	145	24.8	1	0.1			23	3.9			2	0.3

TABLE 10 — LANGUAGE IN WHICH INTERVIEW WAS CONDUCTED

	ENGLISH		SPANISH		ENG/SPAN		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	92	46.4	90	45.4	15	7.5					1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	34	34	62	62	4	4						
FEMALE IMPERIAL	9	4.6	149	77.2	33	17	1	0.5				
MALE IMPERIAL	6	6.4	78	83.8	9	9.6						
TOTAL FEMALE	101	25.8	239	61.1	48	12.2	1	0.2			1	0.2
TOTAL MALE	40	20.7	140	72.5	13	6.7						
GRAND TOTAL	141	24.1	379	64.8	61	10.4	1	0.1			1	0.1

TABLE 11 — PLACE OF EDUCATION

	UNITED STATES		MEXICO		US/MEXICO		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	116	58.5	60	30.3	8	4	2	1	2	1	10	5
MALE FRESNO	43	43	44	44	3	3	1	1			9	9
FEMALE IMPERIAL	32	16.5	125	64.7	16	8.2	2	1	3	1.5	14	7.2
MALE IMPERIAL	20	21.5	57	61.2	1	1	1	1			14	15
TOTAL FEMALE	148	37.8	185	47.3	24	6.1	4	1	5	1.2	24	6.1
TOTAL MALE	63	32.6	101	52.3	4	2	2	1			23	11.9
GRAND TOTAL	211	36.1	286	48.9	28	4.7	6	1	5	0.8	47	8

TABLE 12 — HOME BASE LOCATION

	U.S.		CALI-FORNIA		FRESNO		SACRA-MENTO		FIRE-BAUGH		ORANGE COVE		BRENT-WOOD		IMPERIAL		MEXICO		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	28	14.1	23	11.6	110	55.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5			1	0.5	4	2	29	14.6
MALE FRESNO	3	3	3	3	62	62							1	1			4	4	27	26.9
FEMALE IMPERIAL			14	7.2	1	0.5									103	53.3	59	30.5	16	8.2
MALE IMPERIAL	7	7.5	3	3.2	2	2.1									39	41.9	29	31.1	13	13.9
TOTAL FEMALE	28	7.1	37	9.4	111	28.3	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2			104	26.5	63	16.1	45	11.5
TOTAL MALE	10	5.1	6	3.1	64	33.1							1	0.5	39	20.2	33	17	40	20.7
GRAND TOTAL	38	6.5	43	7.3	175	29.9	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	143	24.4	96	16.4	85	14.5

TABLE 13 — DECLARES A HOME BASE

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	170	85.8	26	13.1			2	1
MALE FRESNO	78	78	21	21			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	163	84.4	28	14.5			2	1
MALE IMPERIAL	88	94.6	3	3.2			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	333	85.1	54	13.8			4	1
TOTAL MALE	166	86	24	12.4			3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	499	85.4	78	13.3			7	1.1

TABLE 14 — TYPE OF HOME BASE HOUSING

	HOUSE		TRAILER		APARTMENT		HOTEL		MOTEL		ROOM /HOUSE		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	163	82.3	5	2.5	22	11.1							5	2.5	1	0.5	2	1
MALE FRESNO	88	88	2	2	4	4					5	5	1	1				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	167	86.5	5	2.5	15	7.7			1	0.5			1	0.5			4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	82	88.1			11	11.8												
TOTAL FEMALE	330	84.3	10	2.5	37	9.4			1	0.2			6	1.5	1	0.2	6	1.5
TOTAL MALE	170	88	2	1	15	7.7					5	2.5	1	0.5				
GRAND TOTAL	500	85.6	12	2	52	8.9			1	0.1	5	0.8	7	1.1	1	0.1	6	1

TABLE 15 — HOME OWNERSHIP

	RENT		OWN		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	94	47.4	87	43.9	13	6.5	1	0.5	3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	49	49	42	42	8	8			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	91	47.1	89	46.1	7	3.6			6	3.1
MALE IMPERIAL	47	50.5	44	47.3	2	2.1				
TOTAL FEMALE	185	47.3	176	45	20	5.1	1	0.2	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	96	49.7	86	44.5	10	5.1			1	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	281	48.1	262	44.8	30	5.1	1	0.1	10	1.7

TABLE 16 — NUMBER OF ROOMS IN RESIDENCE

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	1	0.5	8	4	21	10.6	23	11.6	41	20.7	43	21.7	54	27.2			7	3.5
MALE FRESNO			7	7	20	20	19	19	18	18	17	17	15	15	2	2	2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	2	1	22	11.3	50	25.9	46	23.8	30	15.5	24	12.4	15	7.7			4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	3	3.2	9	9.6	25	26.8	22	23.6	13	13.9	10	10.7	8	8.6			3	3.2
TOTAL FEMALE	3	0.7	30	7.6	71	18.1	69	17.6	71	18.1	67	17.1	69	17.6			11	2.8
TOTAL MALE	3	1.5	16	8.2	45	23.3	41	21.2	31	16	27	13.9	23	11.9	2	1	5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	6	1	46	7.8	116	19.8	110	18.8	102	17.4	94	16	92	15.7	2	0.3	16	2.7

TABLE 17A — SEPARATE KITCHEN

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	103	52	89	44.9			6	3
MALE FRESNO	44	44	51	50.9	2	2	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	103	53.3	85	44	1	0.5	4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	48	51.6	43	46.2			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	206	52.6	174	44.5	1	0.2	10	2.5
TOTAL MALE	92	47.6	94	48.7	2	1	5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	298	51	268	45.8	3	0.5	15	2.5

TABLE 17B — SEPARATE BATHROOM

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	102	51.5	89	44.9	1	0.5	6	3
MALE FRESNO	44	44	52	52	2	2	2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	113	58.5	75	38.8	1	0.5	4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	30	32.2	61	65.5			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	215	54.9	164	41.9	2	0.5	10	2.5
TOTAL MALE	74	38.3	113	58.5	2	1	4	2
GRAND TOTAL	289	49.4	277	47.4	4	0.6	14	2.3

TABLE 18A — NUMBER OF PERSONS AT HOME BASE UNIT

	1		2		3		4		5-6		7-8		9-10		11+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	4	2	9	4.5	26	13.1	33	16.6	61	30.8	30	15.1	24	12.1	5	2.5	1	0.5	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	5	5	12	12	9	9	25	25	20	20	14	14	10	10	3	3			2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	8	4.1	10	5.1	30	15.5	39	20.2	47	24.3	31	16	13	6.7	10	5.1			5	2.5
MALE IMPERIAL	6	6.4	7	7.5	12	12.9	16	17.2	24	25.8	18	19.3	8	8.6	2	2.1				
TOTAL FEMALE	12	3	19	4.8	56	14.3	72	18.4	108	27.6	61	15.6	37	9.4	15	3.8	1	0.2	10	2.5
TOTAL MALE	11	5.6	19	9.8	21	10.8	41	21.2	44	22.7	32	16.5	18	9.3	5	2.5			2	1
GRAND TOTAL	23	3.9	38	6.5	77	13.1	113	19.3	152	26	93	15.9	55	9.4	20	3.4	1	0.1	12	2

TABLE 18B — NUMBER OF PERSONS SHARING RESIDENCE

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	181	91.4	9	4.5	1	0.5	6	3
MALE FRESNO	94	94	2	2			4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	177	91.7	4	2	1	0.5	9	4.6
MALE IMPERIAL	83	89.2	5	5.3			4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	358	91.5	13	3.3	2	0.5	15	3.8
TOTAL MALE	177	91.7	7	3.6			8	4.1
GRAND TOTAL	535	91.6	20	3.4	2	0.3	23	3.9

TABLE 19 — NUMBER OF WAGE EARNERS IN FAMILY

	1		2		3		4		5-6		7-8		9-10		11+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	53	26.7	104	52.5	24	12.1	8	4	5	2.5	2	1							2	1
MALE FRESNO	45	45	34	34	10	10	5	5	3	3									3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	53	27.4	112	58	20	10.3	4	2	1	0.5									3	1.5
MALE IMPERIAL	57	61.2	27	29	6	6.4	2	2.1											1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	106	27.1	216	55.2	44	11.2	12	3	6	1.5	2	0.5							5	1.2
TOTAL MALE	102	52.8	61	31.6	16	8.2	7	3.6	3	1.5									4	2
GRAND TOTAL	208	35.6	277	47.4	60	10.2	19	3.2	9	1.5	2	0.3							9	1.5

TABLE 20 — NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS IN FAMILY

	1		2		3		4		5-6		7-8		9-10		11+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	16	8	30	15.1	36	18.1	37	18.6	42	21.2	18	9	9	4.5	2	1	2	1	6	3
MALE FRESNO	20	20	11	11	14	14	15	15	15	15	14	14	6	6	1	1	1	1	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	17	8.8	18	9.3	37	19.1	36	18.6	37	19.1	23	11.9	13	6.7	6	3.1	1	0.5	5	2.5
MALE IMPERIAL	4	4.3	5	5.3	14	15	15	16.1	30	32.2	15	16.1	9	9.6					1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	33	8.4	48	12.2	73	18.6	73	18.6	79	20.2	41	10.4	22	5.6	8	2	3	0.7	11	2.8
TOTAL MALE	24	12.4	16	8.2	28	14.5	30	15.5	45	23.3	29	15	15	7.7	1	0.5	1	0.5	4	2
GRAND TOTAL	57	9.7	64	10.9	101	17.2	103	17.6	124	21.2	70	11.9	37	6.3	9	1.5	4	0.6	15	2.5

TABLE 21 — LENGTH OF TIME IN CURRENT RESIDENCE

	- 3 MO.		3 MO. - 1 YR		1 - 5 YEARS		8 - 10 YEARS		11+ YEARS		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	13	6.5	65	32.8	54	27.2	39	19.6	18	9	4	2	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	7	7	27	26.9	31	31	27	26.9	7	7			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	9	4.6	66	34.1	53	27.4	54	27.9	5	2.5	2	1	4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	4	4.3	34	36.5	33	35.4	14	15	7	7.5	1	1		
TOTAL FEMALE	22	5.6	131	33.5	107	27.3	93	23.7	23	5.8	6	1.5	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	11	5.6	61	31.6	64	33.1	41	21.2	14	7.2	1	0.5	1	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	33	5.6	192	32.8	171	29.2	134	22.9	37	6.3	7	1.1	10	1.7

TABLE 22 — TOTAL FAMILY INCOME EARNED IN CALIFORNIA

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	182	91.9	13	6.5			3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	90	90	7	7			3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	176	91.1	15	7.7			2	1
MALE IMPERIAL	75	80.6	17	18.2			1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	358	91.5	28	7.1			5	1.2
TOTAL MALE	165	85.4	24	12.4			4	2
GRAND TOTAL	523	89.5	52	8.9			9	1.5

TABLE 23 — AMOUNT OF ANNUAL INCOME EARNED IN AGRICULTURE

	UNDER 1/4		1/4		1/2		3/4		UNDER 1/3		1/3		2/3		ALL		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	27	13.6	8	4	9	4.5	6	3	3	1.5	1	0.5	2	1	135	68.1	3	1.5	4	2
MALE FRESNO	4	4	2	2	3	3	2	2			1	1	3	3	79	79	3	3	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	4	2	7	3.6	10	5.1	1	0.5	3	1.5	4	2			158	81.8	3	1.5	3	1.5
MALE IMPERIAL	1	1	1	1	3	3.2	4	4.3			1	1	1	1	79	84.9	3	3.2		
TOTAL FEMALE	31	7.9	15	3.8	19	4.8	7	1.7	6	1.5	5	1.2	2	0.5	293	74.9	6	1.5	7	1.7
TOTAL MALE	5	2.5	3	1.5	6	3.1	6	3.1			2	1	4	2	158	81.8	6	3.1	3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	36	6.1	18	3	25	4.2	13	2.2	6	1	7	1.1	6	1	451	77.2	12	2	10	1.7

TABLE 24 — PAY U.S. INCOME TAX

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	105	53	89	44.9			4	2
MALE FRESNO	63	63	36	36			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	142	73.5	44	22.7	1	0.5	5	2.5
MALE IMPERIAL	61	65.5	30	32.2			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	247	63.1	133	34	1	0.2	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	124	64.2	66	34.1			3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	371	63.5	199	34	1	0.1	12	2

TABLE 25 — USUAL WEEKLY EARNINGS

	\$50-99		\$100-124		\$125-149		\$150-199		\$200-249		\$250-299		\$300-399		\$400+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	46	23.2	68	34.3	37	18.6	25	12.6	7	3.5	4	2			1	0.5	4	2	6	3
MALE FRESNO	13	13	18	18	23	23	30	30	8	8	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	17	8.8	48	24.8	64	33.1	48	24.8	10	5.1	2	1			1	0.5			3	1.5
MALE IMPERIAL	11	11.8	17	18.2	13	13.9	22	23.6	18	19.3	6	6.4	5	5.3	1	1				
TOTAL FEMALE	63	16.1	116	29.6	101	25.8	73	18.6	17	4.3	6	1.5			2	0.5	4	1	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	24	12.4	35	18.1	36	18.6	52	26.9	26	13.4	8	4.1	6	3.1	2	1	1	0.5	3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	87	14.8	151	25.8	137	23.4	125	21.4	43	7.3	14	2.3	6	1	4	0.6	5	0.8	12	2

TABLE 26 — EARNINGS IN PAST TWO WEEKS

	\$1-50		\$51-100		\$101-150		\$151-200		\$201-300		\$301-400		\$401-500		\$500+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	11	5.5	17	8.5	30	15.1	40	20.2	60	30.3	16	8	8	4	13	6.5	3	1.5		
MALE FRESNO	1	1	7	7	15	15	8	8	34	34	14	14	11	11	8	8	2	2		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	7	3.6	34	17.6	41	21.2	39	20.2	40	20.7	7	3.6	3	1.5	12	6.2	10	5.1		
MALE IMPERIAL	7	7.5	10	10.7	18	19.3	17	18.2	24	25.8	9	9.6	3	3.2	4	4.3	1	1		
TOTAL FEMALE	18	4.6	51	13	71	18.1	79	20.2	100	25.5	23	5.8	11	2.8	25	6.3	13	3.3		
TOTAL MALE	8	4.1	17	8.8	33	17	25	12.9	58	30	23	11.9	14	7.2	12	6.2	3	1.5		
GRAND TOTAL	26	4.4	68	11.6	104	17.8	104	17.8	158	27	46	7.8	25	4.2	37	6.3	16	2.7		

TABLE 27 — CONTRIBUTION TO ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME

	UNDER 1/4		1/4		1/2		3/4		UNDER 1/3		1/3		2/3		ALL		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	56	28.2	17	8.5	20	10.1	6	3	1	0.5	8	4			81	40.9	4	2	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	7	7	2	2	8	8	16	16			3	3	6	6	54	53.9	2	2	2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	10	5.1	15	7.7	20	10.3	1	0.5	3	1.5	6	3.1	3	1.5	127	65.8	1	0.5	7	3.6
MALE IMPERIAL	1	1	3	3.2	6	6.4	5	5.3			1	1	2	2.1	71	76.3	1	1	3	3.2
TOTAL FEMALE	66	16.8	32	8.1	40	10.2	7	1.7	4	1	14	3.5	3	0.7	208	53.1	5	1.2	12	3
TOTAL MALE	8	4.1	5	2.5	14	7.2	21	10.8			4	2	8	4.1	125	64.7	3	1.5	5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	74	12.6	37	6.3	54	9.2	28	4.7	4	0.6	18	3	11	1.8	333	57	8	1.3	17	2.9

TABLE 28 — SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE WHEN NOT WORKING

	STATE/EMP.		STATE/WELFARE		KIN		CHURCH		NONE		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	47	23.3	79	39.3	1	0.4	3	1.4	69	34.3		
MALE FRESNO	30	31.5	18	18.9	1	1			46	48.4		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	95	56.8	20	11.9			1	0.5	51	30.5		
MALE IMPERIAL	52	65	19	23.7					8	10		
TOTAL FEMALE	142	38.5	99	26.9	1	0.2	4	1	120	32.6		
TOTAL MALE	82	46.8	37	21.1	1	0.5			54	30.8		
GRAND TOTAL	224	41.2	136	25	2	0.3	4	0.7	174	32		

TABLE 29 — GENERATIONS FAMILY HAS WORKED IN AGRICULTURE

	1		2		3		4		5+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	16	8	29	14.6	57	28.7	27	13.6	63	31.8	4	2	2	1
MALE FRESNO	18	18	19	19	14	14	6	6	31	31	9	9	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	21	10.8	54	27.9	45	23.3	17	8.8	37	19.1	8	4.1	11	5.6
MALE IMPERIAL	24	25.8	38	40.8	13	13.9	7	7.5	8	8.6	1	1	2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	37	9.4	83	21.2	102	26	44	11.2	100	25.5	12	3	13	3.3
TOTAL MALE	42	21.7	57	29.5	27	13.9	13	6.7	39	20.2	10	5.1	5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	79	13.5	140	23.9	129	22	57	9.7	139	23.8	22	3.7	18	3

TABLE 30 — FAMILY PARTICIPATION IN NON-AGRICULTURAL WORK

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	78	39.3	117	59	1	0.5	2	1
MALE FRESNO	22	22	74	74	2	2	2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	37	19.1	150	77.7	2	1	4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	9	9.6	80	86			4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	115	29.4	267	68.2	3	0.7	6	1.5
TOTAL MALE	31	16	154	79.7	2	1	6	3.1
GRAND TOTAL	146	25	421	72	5	0.8	12	2

TABLE 31 — TYPE OF NON-AGRICULTURAL WORK PERFORMED BY FAMILY

	BLUE COLLAR		WHITE COLLAR		PUBLIC SERVICE		PRIVATE SERVICE		HOUSE CARE		PACK/CAN		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	45	46.8	14	14.5	14	14.5	12	12.5	2	2	9	9.3		
MALE FRESNO	14	51.8	4	14.8	6	22.2	2	7.4			1	3.7		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	16	38	13	30.9	3	7.1	2	4.7	3	7.1	5	11.9		
MALE IMPERIAL	5	55.5					2	22.2			2	22.2		
TOTAL FEMALE	61	44.2	27	19.5	17	12.3	14	10.1	5	3.6	14	10.1		
TOTAL MALE	19	52.7	4	11.1	6	16.6	4	11.1			3	8.3		
GRAND TOTAL	80	45.9	31	17.8	23	13.2	18	10.3	5	2.8	17	9.7		

TABLE 32 — NUMBER OF YEARS IN FARMWORK

	UNDER 5		6-8		9-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		26-30		31+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	45	22.7	32	16.1	18	9	35	17.6	25	12.6	14	7	12	5	14	7			3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	12	12	6	6	9	9	14	14	17	17	8	8	11	11	19	19			4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	66	34.1	45	23.3	24	12.4	20	10.3	9	4.6	9	4.6	3	1.5	9	4.6			8	4.1
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.3	11	11.8	8	8.6	12	12.9	13	13.9	11	11.8	7	7.5	18	19.3	1	1	7	7.5
TOTAL FEMALE	111	28.3	77	19.6	42	10.7	55	14	34	8.6	23	5.8	15	3.8	23	5.8			11	2.8
TOTAL MALE	17	8.8	17	8.8	17	8.8	26	13.4	30	15.5	19	9.8	18	9.3	37	19.1	1	0.5	11	5.6
GRAND TOTAL	128	21.9	94	16	59	10.1	81	13.8	64	10.9	42	7.1	33	5.6	60	10.2	1	0.1	22	3.7

TABLE 33 — PREFERRED NON-AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION

	ANY NON-AGRICUL.		SCHOOL		CAN /PACK		PRO.		WHITE COLLAR		BLUE COLLAR		PUBLIC SERVICE		WELL-PAYING		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	10	4.8	7	3.3	13	6.2	19	9.1	50	24	37	17.7	62	29.8	3	1.4	7	3.3
MALE FRESNO	6	5	1	0.8	10	8.4	5	4.2	9	7.5	77	64.7	9	7.5	1	0.8	1	0.8
FEMALE IMPERIAL	13	7.7	4	2.3	11	6.5	15	8.9	58	34.7	40	23.9	18	10.7			8	4.7
MALE IMPERIAL	4	4.7			3	3.5	5	5.8	4	4.7	66	77.6	3	3.5				
TOTAL FEMALE	23	6.1	11	2.9	24	6.3	34	9	108	28.7	77	20.5	80	21.3	3	0.7	15	4
TOTAL MALE	10	4.9	1	0.4	13	6.3	10	4.9	13	6.3	143	70	12	5.8	1	0.4	1	0.4
GRAND TOTAL	33	5.6	12	2	37	6.3	44	7.5	121	20.8	220	37.9	92	15.8	4	0.6	16	2.7

TABLE 34 — NUMBER OF EMPLOYERS IN A YEAR

	HIGH (6-7+)		MEDIUM (4-5)		LOW (1-3)		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	99	50	85	42.9	13	6.5	1	0.5		
MALE FRESNO	53	53	31	31	15	15	1	1		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	146	75.6	42	21.7	5	2.5				
MALE IMPERIAL	46	49.4	38	40.8	7	7.5	2	2.1		
TOTAL FEMALE	245	62.6	127	32.4	18	4.6	1	0.2		
TOTAL MALE	99	51.2	69	35.7	22	11.3	3	1.5		
GRAND TOTAL	344	58.9	196	33.5	40	6.8	4	0.6		

TABLE 35 — NUMBER OF WEEKS AWAY FROM HOME BASE TO WORK IN AGRICULTURE

	0-4		5-9		10-19		20-29		30-39		40-49+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	77	38.8	12	6	1	0.5	2	1	1	0.5	3	1.5	6	3	96	48.4
MALE FRESNO	44	44	1	1	4	4	12	12	1	1	8	8			30	30
FEMALE IMPERIAL	65	33.6	20	10.3	37	19.1	26	13.4	8	4.1	4	2	4	2	29	15
MALE IMPERIAL	42	45.1	12	12.9	20	21.5	10	10.7	2	2.1	3	3.2			4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	142	36.3	32	8.1	38	9.7	28	7.1	9	2.3	7	1.7	10	2.5	125	31.9
TOTAL MALE	86	44.5	13	6.7	24	12.4	22	11.3	3	1.5	11	5.6			34	17.6
GRAND TOTAL	228	39	45	7.7	62	10.6	50	8.5	12	2	18	3	10	1.7	159	27.2

TABLE 36 — TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK

	OWN CAR		CAR POOL		EMPLOYER		OTHER		BUS		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	121	61.1	65	32.8	5	2.5	3	1.5			2	1	2	1
MALE FRESNO	68	68	12	12	14	14	3	3					3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	56	29	34	17.6	51	26.4	1	0.5	46	23.8	1	0.5	4	2
MALE IMPERIAL	46	49.4	5	5.3	32	34.4			10	10.7				
TOTAL FEMALE	177	45.2	99	25.3	56	14.3	4	1	46	11.7	3	0.7	6	1.5
TOTAL MALE	114	59	17	8.8	46	23.8	3	1.5	10	5.1			3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	291	49.8	116	19.8	102	17.4	7	1.1	56	9.5	3	0.5	9	1.5

TABLE 37 — NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS TRAVELLING TO WORK WITH RESPONDENT

	NONE		1		2		3		4		5		6		7+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	62	31.3	37	18.6	21	10.6	9	4.5	8	4	7	3.5	4	2	4	2	1	0.5	45	22.7
MALE FRESNO	49	49	8	8	6	6	2	2	2	2	2			2	2				29	29
FEMALE IMPERIAL	73	37.8	44	22.7	26	13.4	13	6.7	10	5.1	8	4.1	4	2	7	3.6			8	4.1
MALE IMPERIAL	61	65.5	20	21.5	2	2.1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			6	6.4
TOTAL FEMALE	135	34.5	81	20.7	47	12	22	5.6	18	4.6	15	3.8	8	2	11	2.8	1	0.2	53	13.5
TOTAL MALE	110	56.9	28	14.5	8	4.1	2	1	3	1.5	3	1.5	1	0.5	3	1.5			35	18.1
GRAND TOTAL	245	41.9	109	18.6	55	9.4	24	4.1	21	3.5	18	3	9	1.5	14	2.3	1	0.1	88	15

TABLE 38 — RELATIONSHIP OF TRAVELLING FAMILY MEMBERS

	SPOUSE		PARENTS		SPOUSE PARENT		CHILDREN		SIBLINGS		COUSINS		AUNTS		UNCLES		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	65	30.9	17	8	5	2.3	57	27.1	22	10.4	4	1.9	4	1.9	3	1.4	2	0.9
MALE FRESNO	37	31.6	7	5.9	2	1.7	38	32.4	13	11.1	1	0.8	1	0.8	1	0.8	3	2.5
FEMALE IMPERIAL	75	34	19	8.6	4	1.8	67	30.4	32	14.5	4	1.8	1	0.4	1	0.4	7	3.1
MALE IMPERIAL	49	38.2	5	3.9	2	1.5	57	44.5	11	8.5	1	0.7			1	0.7		
TOTAL FEMALE	140	32.5	36	8.3	9	2	124	28.8	54	12.5	8	1.8	5	1.1	4	0.9	9	2
TOTAL MALE	86	35.1	12	4.8	4	1.6	95	38.7	24	9.7	2	0.8	1	0.4	2	0.8	3	1.2
GRAND TOTAL	226	33.4	48	7.1	13	1.9	219	32.4	78	11.5	10	1.4	6	0.8	6	0.8	12	1.7

TABLE 39 — SEASON MOST FULLY EMPLOYED

	WINTER		SUMMER		WINTER/SUMMER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	7	3.5	162	81.8	26	13.1			3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	7	7	65	65	24	24			4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	81	41.9	56	29	51	26.4			5	2.5
MALE IMPERIAL	24	25.8	50	53.7	18	19.3			1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	88	22.5	218	55.7	77	19.6			8	2
TOTAL MALE	31	16	115	59.5	42	21.7			5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	119	20.3	333	57	119	20.3			13	2.2

TABLE 40 — WEEKS WORKED IN SUMMER

	0 - 4		5 - 9		10 - 19		20 - 29		30 - 39		40 - 49+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	37	18.6	48	24.2	67	33.8	43	21.7	1	0.5					2	1
MALE FRESNO	5	5	11	11	28	28	50	50	1	1	2	2			3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	53	27.4	38	19.6	58	30	29	15	6	3.1	1	0.5	1	0.5	7	3.6
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.3	13	13.9	29	31.1	23	24.7	2	2.1	18	19.3	1	1	2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	90	23	86	21.9	125	31.9	72	18.4	7	1.7	1	0.2	1	0.2	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	10	5.1	24	12.4	57	29.5	73	37.8	3	1.5	20	10.3	1	0.5	5	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	100	17.1	110	18.8	182	31.1	145	24.8	10	1.7	21	3.5	2	0.3	14	2.3

TABLE 41 — WEEKS WORKED IN WINTER

	0-4		5-9		10-19		20-29		30-39		40-49+		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	128	64.6	35	17.6	20	10.1	10	5							5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	23	23	19	19	31	31	22	22							5	5
FEMALE IMPERIAL	27	13.9	29	15	65	33.6	54	27.9	8	4.1	4	2	1	0.5	5	2.5
MALE IMPERIAL	2	2.1	15	16.1	37	39.7	26	27.9	3	3.2	5	5.3	1	1	4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	155	39.6	64	16.3	85	21.7	64	16.3	8	2	4	1	1	0.2	10	2.5
TOTAL MALE	25	12.9	34	17.6	68	35.2	48	24.8	3	1.5	5	2.5	1	0.5	9	4.6
GRAND TOTAL	180	30.8	98	16.7	153	26.1	112	19.1	11	1.8	9	1.5	2	0.3	19	3.2

TABLE 42 — MAJOR CROPS WORKED IN

	FIELD CROP		GRAPES		TREE FRUIT		PEACHES		VEGE- TABLES		TOMATOES		LETTUCE		OTHER		NONE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	88	22.4	102	26	29	7.3	25	6.3	21	5.3	79	20.1	11	2.8	19	4.8	18	4.5
MALE FRESNO	37	14.7	71	28.2	48	19.1	45	17.9	14	5.5	16	7.1	1	0.3	10	3.9	7	2.7
FEMALE IMPERIAL	7	3	6	2.5	4	1.7			34	14.5	18	7.7	121	51.9	15	6.4	28	12
MALE IMPERIAL	26	21.8	2	1.6	2	1.6			21	17.6	4	3.3	45	37.8	11	9.2	8	6.7
TOTAL FEMALE	95	15.1	108	17.2	33	5.2	25	4	55	8.8	97	15.5	132	21.1	34	5.4	46	7.3
TOTAL MALE	63	17	73	19.7	50	13.5	45	12.1	35	9.4	22	5.9	46	12.4	21	5.6	15	4
GRAND TOTAL	158	15.8	181	18.1	83	8.3	70	7	90	9	119	11.9	178	17.8	55	5.5	61	6.1

TABLE 43 — CROPS WORKED IN LONGEST

	FIELD CROP		GRAPES		TREE FRUIT		PEACHES		VEGE- TABLES		TOMATOES		LETTUCE		OTHER		NONE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	38	18.9	74	36.8	12	5.9	13	6.4	4	1.9	32	15.9	2	0.9	7	3.4	19	9.4
MALE FRESNO	15	13.2	36	31.8	13	11.5	27	23.8	5	4.4	4	3.5			3	2.6	10	8.8
FEMALE IMPERIAL	3	1.7	6	3.5	2	1.1			16	9.4	4	2.3	106	62.7	6	3.5	26	15.3
MALE IMPERIAL	14	16.6			1	1.1			11	13			42	50	5	5.9	11	13
TOTAL FEMALE	41	11	80	21.6	14	3.7	13	3.5	20	5.4	36	9.7	108	29.1	13	3.5	45	12.1
TOTAL MALE	29	14.7	36	18.2	14	7.1	27	13.7	16	8.1	4	2	42	21.3	8	4	21	10.6
GRAND TOTAL	70	12.3	116	20.4	28	4.9	40	7	36	6.3	40	7	150	26.4	21	3.7	66	11.6

TABLE 44 — TYPES OF TASKS MOST FREQUENTLY PERFORMED

	MACHINE WORKER		OTHER		PRUNING		GIRDLING		SORTING		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	35	8.4	29	6.9	24	5.7	7	1.6	61	14.6	2	0.4	3	0.7
MALE FRESNO	15	6.1	11	4.5	39	16.1	9	3.7	7	2.8	1	0.4	4	1.6
FEMALE IMPERIAL	58	14.5	18	4.5	6	1.5	1	0.2	32	8	1	0.2		
MALE IMPERIAL	4	2.9	8	5.8	2	1.4			2	1.4				
TOTAL FEMALE	93	11.4	47	5.7	30	3.6	8	0.9	93	11.4	3	0.3	3	0.3
TOTAL MALE	19	5	19	5	41	10.8	9	2.3	9	2.3	1	0.2	4	1
GRAND TOTAL	112	9.3	66	5.5	71	5.9	17	1.4	102	8.5	4	0.3	7	0.5

TABLE 44 — Cont

	WEEDING		HOEING		IRRIGATING		DRIVER		PLANTING		HARVESTING	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	82	19.7	63	15.1	5	1.2	5	1.2	6	1.4	93	22.4
MALE FRESNO	34	14	17	7	10	4.1	17	7	11	4.5	67	27.6
FEMALE IMPERIAL	119	29.7	87	21.7			1	0.2	9	2.2	68	17
MALE IMPERIAL	28	20.4	25	18.2	23	16.7	11	8			34	24.8
TOTAL FEMALE	201	24.6	150	18.4	5	0.6	6	0.7	15	1.8	161	19.7
TOTAL MALE	62	16.3	42	11	33	8.7	28	7.3	11	2.9	101	26.6
GRAND TOTAL	263	22	192	16	38	3.1	34	2.8	26	2.1	262	21.9

TABLE 45 — PREFER PIECE OR HOURLY RATE

	HOURLY		PIECE		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	123	62.1	56	28.2	12	6	1	0.5	6	3
MALE FRESNO	48	48	40	40	7	7	1	1	4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	154	79.7	34	17.6	2	1	1	0.5	2	1
MALE IMPERIAL	58	62.3	34	36.5			1	1		
TOTAL FEMALE	277	70.8	90	23	14	3.5	2	0.5	8	2
TOTAL MALE	106	54.9	74	38.3	7	3.6	2	1	4	2
GRAND TOTAL	383	65.5	164	28	21	3.5	4	0.6	12	2

TABLE 46 — CROPS WORKED IN AFFECTED BY MECHANIZATION

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	83	41.9	71	35.8	7	3.5	37	18.6
MALE FRESNO	44	44	32	32	3	3	21	21
FEMALE IMPERIAL	28	14.5	60	31	10	5.1	94	48.7
MALE IMPERIAL	21	22.5	26	27.9			45	48.3
TOTAL FEMALE	111	28.3	131	33.5	17	4.3	131	33.5
TOTAL MALE	65	33.6	58	30	3	1.5	66	34.1
GRAND TOTAL	176	30.1	189	32.3	20	3.4	197	33.7

TABLE 47 — MECHANIZATION — EFFECTS ON JOBS

	LOST		GAINED		CHANGED		NO AFFECT		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	60	30.3	15	7.5	8	4	13	6.5	28	14.1	74	37.3
MALE FRESNO	39	39	7	7	9	9	4	4	11	11	30	30
FEMALE IMPERIAL	7	3.6	16	8.2	5	2.5	54	27.9	13	6.7	98	50.7
MALE IMPERIAL	18	19.3	2	2.1	2	2.1	27	29	1	1	42	45.1
TOTAL FEMALE	67	17.1	31	7.9	13	3.3	67	17.1	41	10.4	172	43.9
TOTAL MALE	57	29.5	9	4.6	11	5.6	31	16	12	6.2	72	37.3
GRAND TOTAL	124	21.2	40	6.8	24	4.1	98	16.7	53	9	244	41.7

TABLE 48 — TYPES OF MACHINE RELATED JOBS PERFORMED

	OPERATOR		SORT/CLEAN		PROCESSING		MAINTENANCE		SUPERVISE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	11	11.5	78	82.1	6	6.3				
MALE FRESNO	22	50	17	38.6	1	2.2	3	6.8	1	2.2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	2	2.8	66	95.6	1	1.4				
MALE IMPERIAL	18	75	6	25						
TOTAL FEMALE	13	7.9	144	87.8	7	4.2				
TOTAL MALE	40	58.8	23	33.8	1	1.4	3	4.4	1	1.4
GRAND TOTAL	53	22.8	167	71.9	8	3.4	3	1.2	1	0.4

TABLE 49 — PREFER WORK WITH OR WITHOUT MACHINES

	WITH		WITHOUT		DON'T CARE		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	50	25.2	97	48.9	1	0.5	11	5.5	39	19.6
MALE FRESNO	19	19	51	50.9			9	9	21	21
FEMALE IMPERIAL	63	32.6	22	11.3			9	4.6	99	51.2
MALE IMPERIAL	15	16.1	37	39.7			1	1	40	43
TOTAL FEMALE	113	28.9	119	30.4	1	0.2	20	5.1	138	35.2
TOTAL MALE	34	17.6	88	45.5			10	5.1	61	31.6
GRAND TOTAL	147	25.1	207	35.4	1	0.1	30	5.1	199	34

TABLE 50 — EVER BELONGED TO A UNION

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	52	26.2	141	71.2	2	1	3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	29	29	70	70			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	111	57.5	75	38.8	1	0.5	6	3.1
MALE IMPERIAL	54	58	37	39.7			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	163	41.6	216	55.2	3	0.7	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	83	43	107	55.4			3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	246	42.1	323	55.3	3	0.5	12	2

TABLE 51 — PREFER TO HAVE A UNION REPRESENT INTERESTS WITH EMPLOYER

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	104	52.5	34	17.1	17	8.5	43	21.7
MALE FRESNO	75	75	14	14	4	4	7	7
FEMALE IMPERIAL	124	64.2	41	21.2	16	8.2	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	78	83.8	8	8.6	2	2.1	4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	228	58.3	75	19.1	33	8.4	55	14
TOTAL MALE	153	79.2	22	11.3	6	3.1	11	5.6
GRAND TOTAL	381	65.2	97	16.6	39	6.6	66	11.3

TABLE 52 — IF BELONG TO A UNION, DOES UNION REPRESENT INTERESTS

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	25	12.6	5	2.5			168	84.8
MALE FRESNO	9	9	1	1			90	90
FEMALE IMPERIAL	67	34.7	8	4.1	5	2.5	113	58.5
MALE IMPERIAL	26	27.9	4	4.3			63	67.7
TOTAL FEMALE	92	23.5	13	3.3	5	1.2	281	71.8
TOTAL MALE	35	18.1	5	2.5			153	79.2
GRAND TOTAL	127	21.7	18	3	5	0.8	434	74.3

TABLE 53 — BEEN REFERRED TO A JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	24	12.1	164	82.8	3	1.5	7	3.5
MALE FRESNO	14	14	77	77			9	9
FEMALE IMPERIAL	16	8.2	164	84.9	1	0.5	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.3	84	90.3			4	4.3
TOTAL FEMALE	40	10.2	328	83.8	4	1	19	4.8
TOTAL MALE	19	9.8	161	83.4			13	6.7
GRAND TOTAL	59	10.1	489	83.7	4	0.6	32	5.4

TABLE 54 — HEARD OF ANY JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS INTERESTING TO YOU

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	69	34.8	127	64.1	1	0.5	1	0.5
MALE FRESNO	46	46	53	53			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	33	17	147	76.1	1	0.5	11	5.6
MALE IMPERIAL	20	21.5	73	78.4				
TOTAL FEMALE	102	26	274	70	2	0.5	12	3
TOTAL MALE	66	34.1	126	65.2			1	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	168	28.7	400	68.4	2	0.3	13	2.2

TABLE 55 — ATTENDED A JOB TRAINING PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	20	10.1	166	83.8	2	1	10	5
MALE FRESNO	10	10	77	77			13	13
FEMALE IMPERIAL	9	4.6	168	87	4	2	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	6	6.4	84	90.3			3	3.2
TOTAL FEMALE	29	7.4	334	85.4	6	1.5	22	5.6
TOTAL MALE	16	8.2	161	83.4			16	8.2
GRAND TOTAL	45	7.7	495	84.7	6	1	38	6.5

TABLE 56 — HELPED BY THAT CALIFORNIA JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	16	8	50	25.2	7	3.5	125	63.1
MALE FRESNO	4	4	27	26.9	2	2	67	67
FEMALE IMPERIAL	9	4.6	75	38.8	27	13.9	82	42.4
MALE IMPERIAL	3	3.2	37	39.7	7	7.5	46	49.4
TOTAL FEMALE	25	6.3	125	31.9	34	8.6	207	52.9
TOTAL MALE	7	3.6	64	33.1	9	4.6	113	58.5
GRAND TOTAL	32	5.4	189	32.3	43	7.3	320	54.7

TABLE 57 — WISH TO PURSUE A NON-AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	173	87.3	19	9.5			6	3
MALE FRESNO	86	86	11	11			1	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	148	76.6	31	16	2	1	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	72	77.4	20	21.5			1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	321	82	50	12.7	2	0.5	18	4.6
TOTAL MALE	158	81.8	31	16			4	2
GRAND TOTAL	479	82	81	13.8	2	0.3	22	3.7

**TABLE 58 — PREFER AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT TO
NON-AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IF CONDITIONS IMPROVE**

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	108	54.5	84	42.4	2	1	4	2
MALE FRESNO	45	45	51	50.9	1	1	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	85	44	94	48.7	3	1.5	11	5.6
MALE IMPERIAL	71	76.3	22	23.6				
TOTAL FEMALE	193	49.3	178	45.5	5	1.2	15	3.8
TOTAL MALE	116	60.1	73	37.8	1	0.5	3	1.5
GRAND TOTAL	309	52.9	251	42.9	6	1	18	3

TABLE 59A — FORMS OF CHILD CARE

	WIFE		HUSBAND		UNIT RELATION		NONUNIT RELATION		FRIEND		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	6	3	5	2.5	58	29.2	15	7.5	25	12.6	15	7.5	3	1.5	71	35.8
MALE FRESNO	32	32			14	14	2	2	3	3	3	3			46	46
FEMALE IMPERIAL	1	0.5	9	4.6	65	33.6	10	5.1	23	11.9	16	8.2	4	2	65	33.6
MALE IMPERIAL	52	55.9	1	1	7	7.5	2	2.1	1	1	4	4.3	1	1	25	26.8
TOTAL FEMALE	7	1.7	14	3.5	123	31.4	25	6.3	48	12.2	31	7.9	7	1.7	136	34.7
TOTAL MALE	84	43.5	1	0.5	21	10.8	4	2	4	2	7	3.6	1	0.5	71	36.7
GRAND TOTAL	91	15.5	15	2.5	144	24.6	29	4.9	52	8.9	38	6.5	8	1.3	207	35.4

TABLE 59B — PREFERRED FORMS OF CHILD CARE

	KEEP HOME		AT WORK		CENTERS		CNTR/WORK		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	60	30.3	6	3	56	28.2	15	7.5	8	4	53	26.7
MALE FRESNO	24	24			36	36	7	7			33	33
FEMALE IMPERIAL	70	36.2	8	4.1	23	11.9	36	18.6	11	5.6	45	23.3
MALE IMPERIAL	22	23.6	2	2.1	16	17.2	25	26.8			28	30.1
TOTAL FEMALE	130	33.2	14	3.5	79	20.2	51	13	19	4.8	98	25
TOTAL MALE	46	23.8	2	1	52	26.9	32	16.5			61	31.6
GRAND TOTAL	176	30.1	16	2.7	131	22.4	83	14.2	19	3.2	159	27.2

TABLE 60 — LEAVE CHILDREN IN CENTER AT SOME DISTANCE

	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO OPINION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	2	1	22	11.1	113	57	51	25.7	7	3.5
MALE FRESNO	6	6	14	14	55	55	11	11	4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	2	1	16	8.2	106	54.9	44	22.7	13	6.7
MALE IMPERIAL	3	3.2	7	7.5	50	53.7	19	20.4	2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	4	1	38	9.7	219	56	95	24.2	20	5.1
TOTAL MALE	9	4.6	21	10.8	105	54.4	30	15.5	6	3.1
GRAND TOTAL	13	2.2	59	10.1	324	55.4	125	21.4	26	4.4

TABLE 61 — USE CENTER IF AFFORDABLE

	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO OPINION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	29	14.6	126	63.6	19	9.5	12	6	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	15	15	45	45	22	22	5	5	4	4
FEMALE IMPERIAL	11	5.6	113	58.5	28	14.5	8	4.1	15	7.7
MALE IMPERIAL	7	7.5	48	51.6	20	21.5	5	5.3	2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	40	10.2	239	61.1	47	12	20	5.1	20	5.1
TOTAL MALE	22	11.3	93	48.1	42	21.7	10	5.1	6	3.1
GRAND TOTAL	62	10.6	332	56.8	89	15.2	30	5.1	26	4.4

TABLE 62 — USE CENTER IF CLOSE BY

	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO OPINION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	46	23.2	128	64.6	10	5	6	3	6	3
MALE FRESNO	20	20	54	53.9	10	10	4	4	3	3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	24	12.4	124	64.2	13	6.7	6	3.1	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	20	21.5	45	48.3	11	11.8	6	6.4	3	3.2
TOTAL FEMALE	70	17.9	252	64.4	23	5.8	12	3	18	4.6
TOTAL MALE	40	20.7	99	51.2	21	10.8	10	5.1	6	3.1
GRAND TOTAL	110	18.8	351	60.1	44	7.5	22	3.7	24	4.1

TABLE 63 — PREFERRED CHILD CARE CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

	HOUR ACCESS		LOCATION ACCESS		STAFF		EDUCATION		MULTI-SERVICE		COST		REC-REATION		CON-DITIONS		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	28	10.4	6	2.2	23	8.5	62	23.1	94	35	12	4.4	20	7.4	14	5.2	9	3.3
MALE FRESNO	1	0.9	5	4.5	8	7.2	33	30	43	39	4	3.6	11	10	4	3.6	1	0.9
FEMALE IMPERIAL	17	10.6	33	20.6	8	5	18	11.2	63	39.3	3	1.8	9	5.6	2	1.2	7	4.3
MALE IMPERIAL	7	16.2	17	39.5	2	4.6	6	13.9	8	18.6			2	4.6			1	2.3
TOTAL FEMALE	45	10.5	39	9.1	31	7.2	80	18.6	157	36.6	15	3.5	29	6.7	16	3.7	16	3.7
TOTAL MALE	8	5.2	22	14.3	10	6.5	39	25.4	51	33.3	4	2.6	13	8.4	4	2.6	2	1.3
GRAND TOTAL	53	9.1	61	10.4	41	7	119	20.4	208	35.8	19	3.2	42	7.2	20	3.4	18	3

TABLE 64 — PARTY RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE

	SELF		STATE		CAMP		COUNTY		GROWER		OTHER		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	121	61.1	20	10.1	2	1	31	15.6	4	2	13	6.5	4	2	3	1
MALE FRESNO	72	72	4	4	1	1	11	11	6	6	3	3	2	2	1	0
FEMALE IMPERIAL	116	60.1	6	3.1	6	3.1	3	1.5	35	18.1	14	7.2	5	2.5	8	4
MALE IMPERIAL	39	41.9	3	3.2			3	3.2	30	32.2	6	6.4	4	4.3	8	8
TOTAL FEMALE	237	60.6	26	6.6	8	2	34	8.6	39	0.9	27	6.9	9	2.3	11	2
TOTAL MALE	111	57.5	7	3.6	1	0.5	14	7.2	36	18.6	9	4.6	6	3.1	9	4
GRAND TOTAL	348	59.5	33	5.6	9	1.5	48	8.2	75	12.8	36	6.1	15	2.5	20	3

TABLE 65 — HEALTH INSURANCE AVAILABLE AT PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	70	35.3	112	56.5	11	5.5	5	2.5
MALE FRESNO	45	45	50	50			5	5
FEMALE IMPERIAL	133	68.9	44	22.7	9	4.6	7	3.6
MALE IMPERIAL	55	59.1	34	36.5	1	1	3	3.2
TOTAL FEMALE	203	51.9	156	39.8	20	5.1	12	3
TOTAL MALE	100	51.8	84	43.5	1	0.5	8	4.1
GRAND TOTAL	303	51.8	240	41	21	3.5	20	3.4

TABLE 66 — HEALTH SERVICE AVAILABLE DURING NON-WORKING HOURS

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	74	37.3	119	60.1	2	1	3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	42	42	56	56			2	2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	119	61.6	61	31.6	7	3.6	6	3.1
MALE IMPERIAL	69	74.1	23	24.7	1	1		
TOTAL FEMALE	193	49.3	180	46	9	2.3	9	2.3
TOTAL MALE	111	57.5	79	40.9	1	0.5	2	1
GRAND TOTAL	304	52	259	44.3	10	1.7	11	1.8

TABLE 67 — PREFERRED HEALTH CARE SERVICES AND CHARACTERISTICS

	HOUR ACCESS		TEETH /EYES		OBS/GYN		EMER- GENCY		LOCATION ACCESS		MULTI- SERVICE		COST		STAFF		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	71	20.6	84	24.4	15	4.3	24	6.9	19	5.5	62	18	25	7.2	33	9.5	11	3.1
MALE FRESNO	36	18.3	50	25.5	2	1	10	5.1	10	5.1	53	27	24	12.2	9	4.5	2	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	25	9.3	108	40.2	9	3.3	8	2.9	8	2.9	49	18.2	22	8.2	26	9.7	13	4.8
MALE IMPERIAL	8	5.5	64	44.4	2	1.3	8	5.5	4	2.7	44	30.5	9	6.2	5	3.4		
TOTAL FEMALE	96	15.6	192	31.3	24	3.9	32	5.2	27	4.4	111	18.1	47	7.6	59	9.6	24	3.9
TOTAL MALE	44	12.9	114	33.5	4	1.1	18	5.2	14	4.1	97	28.5	33	9.7	14	4.1	2	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	140	14.7	306	32.1	28	2.9	50	5.2	41	4.3	208	21.8	80	8.4	73	7.6	26	2.7

TABLE 68A — HOUSING AVAILABLE WHEN AWAY FROM HOME BASE

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	14	7	26	13.1	8	4	150	75.7
MALE FRESNO	15	15	19	19	3	3	63	63
FEMALE IMPERIAL	35	18.1	96	49.7	19	9.8	40	20.7
MALE IMPERIAL	29	31.1	38	40.8	7	7.5	18	19.3
TOTAL FEMALE	49	12.5	122	31.2	27	6.9	190	48.5
TOTAL MALE	44	22.7	57	29.5	10	5.1	81	41.9
GRAND TOTAL	93	15.9	179	30.6	37	6.3	271	46.4

TABLE 68B — AVAILABLE HOUSING USUALLY IN MIGRANT CAMP

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	1	0.5	17	8.5	11	5.5	169	85.3
MALE FRESNO	10	10	10	10			80	80
FEMALE IMPERIAL	13	6.7	42	21.7	11	5.6	127	65.8
MALE IMPERIAL	26	27.9	14	15	3	3.2	50	53.7
TOTAL FEMALE	14	3.5	59	15	22	5.6	296	75.7
TOTAL MALE	36	18.6	24	12.4	3	1.5	130	67.3
GRAND TOTAL	50	8.5	83	14.2	25	4.2	426	72.9

TABLE 69 — PROBLEMS IN LOCATING HOUSING (AREAS)

	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA		CENTRAL CALIFORNIA		SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA		EVERYWHERE		NON-CALIFORNIA		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	1	2.7	28	75.6			7	18.9	1	2.7		
MALE FRESNO	1	2.5	23	57.5	4	10	9	22.5	3	7.5		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	27	20.7	97	74.6	1	0.7	4	3	1	0.7		
MALE IMPERIAL	10	21.2	32	68	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2		
TOTAL FEMALE	28	16.7	125	74.8	1	0.5	11	6.5	2	1.1		
TOTAL MALE	11	12.6	55	63.2	5	5.7	11	12.6	5	5.7		
GRAND TOTAL	39	15.3	180	70.8	6	2.3	22	8.6	7	2.7		

TABLE 70 — PROBLEMS IN OBTAINING HOUSING (OBSTACLES)

	NO HOUSING		COST		CHILDREN		NONE		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	21	52.4	8	20	8	20	2	5	1	2.5
MALE FRESNO	19	76	3	12	3	12				
FEMALE IMPERIAL	98	67.1	41	28	6	4.1			1	0.6
MALE IMPERIAL	34	75.5	8	17.7	3	6.6				
TOTAL FEMALE	119	63.9	49	26.3	14	7.5	2	1	2	1
TOTAL MALE	53	75.7	11	15.7	6	8.5				
GRAND TOTAL	172	67.1	60	23.4	20	7.8	2	0.7	2	0.7

TABLE 71 — NEED MORE MIGRANT CAMP HOUSING

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	160	80.8	8	4	8	4	22	11.1
MALE FRESNO	76	76	7	7	5	5	12	12
FEMALE IMPERIAL	158	81.8	4	2	13	6.7	18	9.3
MALE IMPERIAL	75	80.6	1	1	3	3.2	14	15
TOTAL FEMALE	318	81.3	12	3	21	5.3	40	10.2
TOTAL MALE	151	78.2	8	4.1	8	4.1	26	13.4
GRAND TOTAL	469	80.3	20	3.4	29	4.9	66	11.3

TABLE 72 — RISKS TO HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK

	MACHINE		EQUIP- MENT		STRESS		SANI- TATION		CHEMICALS		FIELD		WATER /BREAKS		WEATHER		NONE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	98	26.5	57	15.4	9	2.4	32	8.6	78	21.1	47	12.7	9	2.4	5	1.3	34	9.2
MALE FRESNO	50	23.8	44	20.9	11	5.2	4	1.9	45	21.4	28	13.3	4	1.9	15	7.1	9	4.2
FEMALE IMPERIAL	47	15.2	30	9.7	14	4.5	36	11.6	30	9.7	84	27.1	22	7.1	11	3.5	35	11.3
MALE IMPERIAL	20	14.1	18	12.7	7	4.9	5	3.5	46	32.6	14	9.9	5	3.5	18	12.7	8	5.6
TOTAL FEMALE	145	21.3	87	12.8	23	3.3	68	10	108	15.9	131	19.3	31	4.5	16	2.3	69	10.1
TOTAL MALE	70	19.9	62	17.6	18	5.1	9	2.5	91	25.9	42	11.9	9	2.5	33	9.4	17	4.8
GRAND TOTAL	215	20.8	149	14.4	41	3.9	77	7.4	199	19.3	173	16.8	40	3.8	49	4.7	86	8.3

TABLE 73 — HOW REDUCE RISKS TO HEALTH AND SAFETY

	MACHINES		CON- DITIONS		EQUIP- MENT		SANI- TATION		CHEMICALS		FIELD		CONCERN		REGU- LATIONS		UNKNOWN		NOTHING	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	52	22.3	9	3.8	26	11.1	17	7.2	45	19.3	19	8.1	9	3.8	11	4.7	22	9.4	23	9.8
MALE FRESNO	11	11	9	9	19	19	3	3	19	19	6	6	11	11	4	4	9	9	9	9
FEMALE IMPERIAL	27	12.3	12	5.4	28	12.7	24	10.9	21	9.5	19	8.6	21	9.5	2	0.9	39	17.8	26	11.8
MALE IMPERIAL	13	13.4	12	12.3	9	9.2	6	6.1	31	31.9	6	6.1	7	7.2	2	2	5	5.1	6	6.1
TOTAL FEMALE	79	17.4	21	4.6	54	11.9	41	9	66	14.6	38	8.4	30	6.6	13	2.8	61	13.4	49	10.8
TOTAL MALE	24	12.1	21	10.6	28	14.2	9	4.5	50	25.3	12	6	18	9.1	6	3	14	7.1	15	7.6
GRAND TOTAL	103	15.8	42	6.4	82	12.6	50	7.7	116	17.8	50	7.7	48	7.3	19	2.9	75	11.5	64	9.8

TABLE 74A — PARTICIPATE IN CAMP MEETINGS

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	1	0.5	6	3	9	4.5	182	91.9
MALE FRESNO	1	1	3	3	1	1	95	95
FEMALE IMPERIAL	8	4.1	9	4.6	24	12.4	152	78.7
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.3	3	3.2	2	2.1	83	89.2
TOTAL FEMALE	9	2.3	15	3.8	33	8.4	334	85.4
TOTAL MALE	6	3.1	6	3.1	3	1.5	178	92.2
GRAND TOTAL	15	2.5	21	3.5	36	6.1	512	87.6

TABLE 74B — JOB EVER OBTAINED THROUGH EDD

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	42	21.2	145	73.2			11	5.5
MALE FRESNO	18	18	66	66			16	16
FEMALE IMPERIAL	15	7.7	167	86.5	1	0.5	10	5.1
MALE IMPERIAL	13	13.9	79	84.9			1	1
TOTAL FEMALE	57	14.5	312	79.7	1	0.2	21	5.3
TOTAL MALE	31	16	145	75.1			17	8.8
GRAND TOTAL	88	15	457	78.2	1	0.1	38	6.5

TABLE 74C — EVER USED EDD SERVICES

	YES		NO		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	120	60.6	73	36.8	1	0.5	4	2
MALE FRESNO	51	50.9	48	48			1	1
FEMALE IMPERIAL	128	66.3	56	29	1	0.5	8	4.1
MALE IMPERIAL	80	86	13	13.9				
TOTAL FEMALE	248	63.4	129	32.9	2	0.5	12	3
TOTAL MALE	131	67.8	61	31.6			1	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	379	64.8	190	32.5	2	0.3	13	2.2

TABLE 74D — EDD SERVICES MOST USED

	UNEMPLOYMENT		JOB FINDING		JOB TRAINING		WIN		OTHER		UNEMP/ JOB		UNKNOWN		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	68	34.3	19	9.5	3	1.5			1	0.5	32	16.1	3	1.5	72	36
MALE FRESNO	29	29	4	4	1	1	1	1			17	17			48	
FEMALE IMPERIAL	108	55.9	5	2.5	2	1					20	10.3	13	6.7	45	23
MALE IMPERIAL	66	70.9	3	3.2					1	1	10	10.7	1	1	12	12
TOTAL FEMALE	176	45	24	6.1	5	1.2			1	0.2	52	13.2	16	4	117	29
TOTAL MALE	95	49.2	7	3.6	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	27	13.9	1	0.5	60	
GRAND TOTAL	271	46.4	31	5.3	6	1	1	0.1	2	0.3	79	13.5	17	2.9	177	30

TABLE 75 — WOMEN PAID AS MUCH AS MEN FOR SAME JOBS:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX

		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		YES		NO		YES		NO				
EDUCATION	SEX	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%
LOW	MALE	21	16.7	1	.7	89	71.1	14	11.1	11	125	100
	FEMALE	108	41.6	40	15.4	87	33.5	24	9.2	20	259	100
HIGH	MALE	22	44	6	12	15	30	7	14	3	50	100
	FEMALE	39	36.7	32	30.1	16	15	19	17.9	4	106	100
COLUMN TOTALS		190	35.1	79	14.6	207	38.3	64	11.8	38	540	100

TABLE 76 — AVERAGE NUMBER OF WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX

EDUCATION	SEX	EXPERIENCE — LOW			EXPERIENCE — HIGH			MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		N	AVG	%	N	AVG	%		N	%
LOW	MALE	21	26.6	16.7	104	35.9	83.2	9	125	100
	FEMALE	155	24.1	57.8	113	22.5	42.1	7	268	100
HIGH	MALE	28	31.8	54.9	23	34.3	45	2	51	100
	FEMALE	72	20.7	67.2	35	17.2	32.7	1	107	100
COLUMN TOTALS		276		50	275		49.9	19	551	100

TABLE 77 — ANNUAL INCOME: CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX

EDUCATION	SEX	EXPERIENCE — LOW			EXPERIENCE — HIGH			MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		N	AVG	%	N	AVG	%	N	N	%
LOW	MALE	21	3722	16.7	104	6349	83.2	9	125	100
	FEMALE	153	3342	58.1	110	3093	41.8	7	263	100
HIGH	MALE	28	5374	56	22	6332	44	2	50	100
	FEMALE	69	2806	66.9	34	2045	33	1	103	100
COLUMN TOTALS		271		50	270		49.9	19	541	100

TABLE 78 — WEEKLY INCOME: CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX

EDUCATION	SEX	EXPERIENCE — LOW			EXPERIENCE — HIGH			MISSING			ROW TOTALS	
		N	AVG	%	N	AVG	%	N	AVG	%	N	%
LOW	MALE	22	143	17.3	105	166	82.6	9	157	7	127	93.3
	FEMALE	156	132	57.7	114	130	42.2	9	106	3.3	270	96.7
	MISSING	1	137	100				1	137	100	1	50
HIGH	MALE	28	155	54.9	23	156	45	2	168	3.9	51	96.2
	FEMALE	73	133	66.9	36	113	33	1	112	.9	109	99
	MISSING											

**TABLE 79 — AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

EDUCATION	SEX	EXPERIENCE — LOW				EXPERIENCE — HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		UNDER AVG		OVER AVG		UNDER AVG		OVER AVG		N	N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
LOW	MALE	14	11.1	8	6.3	49	38.8	55	43.6	10	126	100
	FEMALE	117	44.1	37	13.9	81	30.5	30	11.3	14	265	100
HIGH	MALE	16	32	12	24	10	20	12	24	3	50	100
	FEMALE	49	47.1	21	20.1	27	25.9	7	6.7	6	104	100
COLUMN TOTALS		196	35.9	78	14.3	167	30.6	104	19	33	545	100

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME OF FARMWORKERS = \$138.98

**TABLE 80 — AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

EDUCATION		SEX		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS		
				UNDER AVG		OVER AVG		UNDER AVG		OVER AVG			N	N	%
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
LOW	MALE	14	11.1	7	5.5	38	30.3	66	52.7	11	125	100			
	FEMALE	100	38	53	20.1	85	32.3	25	9.5	16	263	100			
HIGH	MALE	14	28	14	28	10	20	12	24	3	50	100			
	FEMALE	53	51.4	16	15.5	30	29.1	4	3.8	7	103	100			
COLUMN TOTALS		181	33.4	90	16.6	163	30.1	107	19.7	37	541	100			

AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME OF FARMWORKERS = \$3,898.28

**TABLE 81 — WOMEN ABLE BUT LACK TRAINING:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		YES		NO		YES		NO				
EDUCATION	SEX	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%
LOW	MALE	1	16.6	1	16.6	3	50	1	16.6	130	6	100
	FEMALE	107	42.9	40	16	75	30.1	27	10.8	30	249	100
HIGH	MALE	2	50			2	50			49	4	100
	FEMALE	48	46.6	22	21.3	24	23.3	9	8.7	7	103	100
COLUMN TOTALS		158	43.6	63	17.4	104	28.7	37	10.2	216	362	100

**TABLE 82 — WOMEN CAN DO SAME WORK AS MEN BUT ARE NOT HIRED:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

EDUCATION		SEX		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS		
				YES		NO		YES		NO			N	N	%
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
LOW	MALE			2	28.5	3	42.8	2	28.5	129	7	100			
	FEMALE	76	33	55	23.9	64	27.8	35	15.2	49	230	100			
HIGH	MALE	2	40			3	60			48	5	100			
	FEMALE	35	36.8	25	26.3	20	21	15	15.7	15	95	100			
COLUMN TOTALS		113	33.5	82	24.3	90	26.7	52	15.4	241	337	100			

**TABLE 83 — WOMEN ABLE TO DO THE SAME WORK AS MEN:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		YES		NO		YES		NO				
EDUCATION	SEX	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%
LOW	MALE	11	9	10	8.2	63	52	37	30.5	15	121	100
	FEMALE	102	40	43	16.8	90	35.2	20	7.8	24	255	100
HIGH	MALE	19	37.2	9	17.6	14	27.4	9	17.6	2	51	100
	FEMALE	52	50	18	17.3	27	25.9	7	6.7	6	104	100
COLUMN TOTALS		184	34.6	80	15	194	36.5	73	13.7	47	531	100

**TABLE 84 — WOULD LEAVE AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IF RETRAINING AVAILABLE:
CONTROLLING FOR EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, SEX**

		EXPERIENCE – LOW				EXPERIENCE – HIGH				MISSING	ROW TOTALS	
		YES		NO		YES		NO			N	N
EDUCATION	SEX	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
LOW	MALE	19	15	3	2.3	93	73.8	11	8.7	10	126	100
	FEMALE	132	50.5	19	7.2	98	37.5	12	4.5	18	261	100
HIGH	MALE	23	46.9	3	6.1	18	36.7	5	10.2	4	49	100
	FEMALE	65	62.5	5	4.8	31	29.8	3	2.8	6	104	100
COLUMN TOTALS		239	44.2	30	5.5	240	44.4	31	5.7	38	540	100

TABLE 85 — OBSTACLES TO CHANGING OCCUPATIONS

	AGE		LANGUAGE		FAMILY		NO EDUCATION		FEAR		TRANS-PORTATION		COST		LIKES JOB		NO JOBS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	5	2.2	25	11.2	44	19.8	93	41.8	6	2.7	21	9.4	15	6.7	1	0.4	12	5.4
MALE FRESNO	5	4.7	21	20	5	4.7	51	48.5	3	2.8	3	2.8	12	11.4	4	3.8	1	0.9
FEMALE IMPERIAL	14	7.2	30	15.4	16	8.2	91	46.9			6	3	12	6.1	6	3	19	9.7
MALE IMPERIAL	5	5.7	14	16			55	63.2	3	3.4			5	5.7	1	1.1	4	4.5
TOTAL FEMALE	19	4.5	55	13.2	60	14.4	184	44.2	6	1.4	27	6.4	27	6.4	7	1.6	31	7.4
TOTAL MALE	10	5.2	35	18.2	5	2.6	106	55.2	6	3.1	3	1.5	17	8.8	5	2.6	5	2.6
GRAND TOTAL	29	4.7	90	14.8	65	10.6	290	47.6	12	1.9	30	4.9	44	7.2	12	1.9	36	5.9

TABLE 86 — CROPS GROWN DURING YEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	COUNT	PERCENT OF RESPONSES	PERCENT OF CASES
FIELD CROPS	58	47.5	145.0
GRAPES	25	20.5	62.5
TREE FRUITS	14	11.5	35.0
PEACHES	3	2.5	7.5
VEGETABLES & RELATED	10	8.2	25.0
TOMATOES	1	0.8	2.5
LETTUCE	11	9.0	27.5
TOTAL RESPONSES	122	100.0	305.0

0 MISSING CASES

40 VALID CASES

TABLE 87 — NUMBER OF ACRES OWNED

CATEGORY LABEL (Number of Acres)	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
	0	5	12.5	12.5	12.5
	20	1	2.5	2.5	15.0
	32	1	2.5	2.5	17.5
	40	2	5.0	5.0	22.5
	50	1	2.5	2.5	25.0
	60	1	2.5	2.5	27.5
	80	2	5.0	5.0	32.5
	105	1	2.5	2.5	35.0
	120	2	5.0	5.0	40.0
	145	1	2.5	2.5	42.5
	150	1	2.5	2.5	45.0
	160	2	5.0	5.0	50.0
	240	2	5.0	5.0	55.0
	350	1	2.5	2.5	57.5
	395	1	2.5	2.5	60.0
	500	1	2.5	2.5	62.5
	640	1	2.5	2.5	65.0
640 ACRES & OVER	641	14	35.0	35.0	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.00	100.00	

TABLE 88 — YEARS IN FARMING

CATEGORY LABEL (Number of years)	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
	3	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	7	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
	10	2	5.0	5.0	10.0
	11	1	2.5	2.5	12.5
	13	1	2.5	2.5	15.0
	17	2	5.0	5.0	20.0
	18	1	2.5	2.5	22.5
	20	3	7.5	7.5	30.0
	23	1	2.5	2.5	32.5
	25	2	5.0	5.0	37.5
	27	1	2.5	2.5	40.0
	28	2	5.0	5.0	45.0
	30	7	17.5	17.5	62.5
	31	1	2.5	2.5	65.0
	32	2	5.0	5.0	70.0
	35	2	5.0	5.0	75.0
	40	8	20.0	20.0	95.0
	42	1	2.5	2.5	97.5
	45	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 89 — WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FARM

CATEGORY LABEL	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER, NOT APPLICABLE	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP	31	77.5	77.5	80.0
PARTNERSHIP	3	7.5	7.5	87.5
CORPORATE FARM	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 90A — WOMEN AS DEPENDABLE AS MEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	10.0	10.0	12.5
AGREE	2	28	70.0	70.0	82.5
DISAGREE	3	4	10.0	10.0	92.5
NO OPINION	5	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 90B — WOMEN PHYSICALLY ABLE AS MEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
AGREE	2	4	10.0	10.0	15.0
DISAGREE	3	30	75.0	75.0	90.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 91 — HIRE WOMEN TO OPERATE MACHINERY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	7.5	7.5	12.5
AGREE	2	12	30.0	30.0	42.5
DISAGREE	3	19	47.5	47.5	90.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	3	7.5	7.5	97.5
NO OPINION	5	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

**TABLE 92 — WITHIN PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS WOMEN CAN
BE TRAINED TO DO SAME TASKS AS MEN**

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
AGREE	2	27	67.5	67.5	70.0
DISAGREE	3	8	20.0	20.0	90.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	3	7.5	7.5	97.5
NO OPINION	5	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 93 — MEN MORE COOPERATIVE THAN WOMEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	7.5	7.5	12.5
AGREE	2	4	10.0	10.0	22.5
DISAGREE	3	25	62.5	62.5	85.0
NO OPINION	5	6	15.0	15.0	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 94A — JOB TRAINING GOOD FOR WOMEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	10.0	10.0	15.0
AGREE	2	17	42.5	42.5	57.5
DISAGREE	3	11	27.5	27.5	85.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1	2.5	2.5	87.5
NO OPINION	5	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 94B — JOB TRAINING GOOD FOR MEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	15.0	15.0	20.0
AGREE	2	20	50.0	50.0	70.0
DISAGREE	3	6	15.0	15.0	85.0
NO OPINION	5	6	15.0	15.0	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 95 — WOMEN ARE AS PRODUCTIVE AS MEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	7.5	7.5	10.0
AGREE	2	28	70.0	70.0	80.0
DISAGREE	3	4	10.0	10.0	90.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1	2.5	2.5	92.5
NO OPINION	5	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 96 — WOMEN ARE HARD WORKERS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
AGREE	2	30	75.0	75.0	80.0
DISAGREE	3	6	15.0	15.0	95.0
NO OPINION	5	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 97A — SEASONAL JOBS FOR MEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
SKILLED	1	9	22.5	22.5	22.5
SEMI-SKILLED	2	14	35.0	35.0	57.5
UNSKILLED	3	17	42.5	42.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 97B — SEASONAL JOBS FOR WOMEN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER, NOT APPLIC.	0	4	10.0	10.0	10.0
SKILLED	1	2	5.0	5.0	15.0
SEMI-SKILLED	2	14	35.0	35.0	50.0
UNSKILLED	3	19	47.5	47.5	97.5
NO OPINION	9	1	2.5	2.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 98A — AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM AREAS MOST IMPORTANT TO CHANGE

	CON- DITIONS		PAY/ BENEFITS		CHILD CARE		HOUSING		DISCRI- MINATION		MOBILITY		ORGANI- ZATION		EVERY- THING		ATTITUDES	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	28	8.5	201	61.6	10	3	51	15.6	2	0.6	21	6.4	2	0.6	6	1.8	5	1.5
MALE FRESNO	27	13	117	56.5			36	17.3	1	0.4	5	2.4	3	1.4	9	4.3	9	4.3
FEMALE IMPERIAL	21	7	178	59.3			65	21.6			26	8.6	1	0.3	6	2	3	1
MALE IMPERIAL	25	12.6	110	55.5	1	0.5	36	18.1			19	9.5	1	0.5	4	2	2	1
TOTAL FEMALE	49	7.8	379	60.5	10	1.5	116	13.5	2	0.3	47	7.5	3	0.4	12	1.9	8	1.2
TOTAL MALE	52	12.8	227	56	1	0.2	72	17.7	1	0.2	24	5.9	4	0.9	13	3.2	11	2.7
GRAND TOTAL	101	9.7	606	58.7	11	1	188	18.2	3	0.2	71	6.8	7	0.6	25	2.4	19	1.8

TABLE 98B — HOW TO CHANGE AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM AREAS

	CONDITIONS		PAY/ BENEFITS		EDUCATION		HOUSING		DISCRI- MINATION		ORGANI- ZATION		EMP. RES/ON- SIBILITY		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	10	4.5	83	37.7	7	3.1	19	8.6	5	2.2	3	1.3	57	25.9	12	5.4
MALE FRESNO	5	4.2	43	36.7			9	7.6	2	1.7	1	0.8	43	36.7	8	6.8
FEMALE IMPERIAL	11	4.5	117	48.7	4	1.6	52	21.6	5	2	13	5.4	16	6.6	3	1.2
MALE IMPERIAL	4	3.1	34	26.5	5	3.9	21	16.4	1	0.7	5	3.9	56	43.7	1	0.7
TOTAL FEMALE	21	4.5	200	43.4	11	2.3	71	15.4	10	2.1	16	3.4	73	15.8	15	3.2
TOTAL MALE	9	3.6	77	31.4	5	2	30	12.2	3	1.2	6	2.4	99	40.4	9	3.6
GRAND TOTAL	30	4.2	277	39.2	16	2.2	101	14.3	13	1.8	22	3.1	172	24.3	24	3.4

TABLE 98C — GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE SERVICES

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (Percent)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)	CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (Percent)
NO ANSWER	0	3	7.5	7.5	7.5
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	15.0	15.0	22.5
AGREE	2	19	47.5	47.5	70.0
DISAGREE	3	6	15.0	15.0	85.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1	2.5	2.5	87.5
NO OPINION	5	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
TOTAL		40	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 99 — FARMWORK ADEQUATE FOR SELF BUT NOT CHILDREN

	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE		NO OPINION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	88	44.4	89	44.9	8	4	6	3	3	1.5
MALE FRESNO	27	26.9	41	41	7	7	5	5	15	15
FEMALE IMPERIAL	81	41.9	64	33.1	7	3.6	22	11.3	12	6.2
MALE IMPERIAL	59	63.4	25	26.8	2	2.1			2	2.1
TOTAL FEMALE	169	43.2	153	39.1	15	3.8	28	7.1	15	3.8
TOTAL MALE	86	44.5	66	34.1	9	4.6	5	2.5	17	8.8
GRAND TOTAL	255	43.6	219	37.5	24	4.1	33	5.6	32	5.4

TABLE 100 — BEST CHARACTERISTICS OF FARMWORK

	HEALTH		FREEDOM		FRIEND /FAMILY		NECESSITY		LIKE IT		PAY/ BENEFITS		EDU- CATION		SPECIAL TASK		NOTHING		EVERY- THING	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE FRESNO	54	24.4	49	22.1	17	7.6	5	2.2	11	4.9	26	11.7	4	1.8	11	4.9	42	19	1	0.4
MALE FRESNO	43	32.8	21	16	4	3	1	0.7	3	2.2	7	5.3	10	7.6	10	7.6	32	24.4		
FEMALE IMPERIAL	33	18	15	8.1	3	1.6	10	5.4	3	1.6	23	12.5	9	4.9	6	3.2	79	43.1	2	1
MALE IMPERIAL	16	18.6	8	9.3	3	3.4	2	2.3	2	2.3	6	6.9	3	3.4	10	11.6	36	41.8		
TOTAL FEMALE	87	21.5	64	15.8	20	4.9	15	3.7	14	3.4	49	12.1	13	3.2	17	4.2	121	29.9	3	0.7
TOTAL MALE	59	27.1	29	13.3	7	3.2	3	1.3	5	2.3	13	5.9	13	5.9	20	9.2	68	31.3		
GRAND TOTAL	146	23.5	93	14.9	27	4.3														

APPENDIX

Percent of Accuracy Calculated on a Given Sample

Size	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%
100	99	97	92	86	80	73	67	61	55	49
150	148	142	132	121	108	97	85	76	67	59
200	196	185	169	151	132	115	99	86	75	65
250	244	227	203	177	152	130	110	94	81	70
300	291	267	235	201	169	142	119	101	85	73
350	338	306	264	222	184	152	126	106	89	76
400	385	343	291	241	196	161	132	110	92	78
450	430	379	317	258	208	168	137	113	94	80
500	476	414	341	273	218	174	141	116	96	81
600	565	481	385	301	235	185	148	121	100	83
700	653	542	423	324	249	194	154	124	102	85
800	739	601	458	343	260	201	158	127	104	86
900	823	655	489	361	270	206	161	129	105	87
1000	906	706	517	376	278	211	164	131	106	88
1200	1067	801	565	401	292	219	169	134	108	89
1400	1222	885	606	421	302	225	172	136	110	90
1600	1372	961	641	437	310	229	175	138	111	91
1800	1516	1029	670	451	317	233	177	139	112	92
2000	1656	1092	696	462	323	236	179	140	112	92
2500	1984	1225	748	485	333	242	182	142	114	93*
3000	2286	1334	788	501	341	245	184	143	115	94
3500	2566	1425	818	513	347	248	186	144	115	94
4000	2824	1501	843	522	351	251	187	145	116	94
4500	3065	1566	863	530	354	252	188	146	116	95
5000	3289	1623	880	536	357	254	189	146	116	95
6000	3693	1715	906	540	362	256	190	147	117	95
7000	4049	1788	926	553	365	257	191	147	117	95
8000	4365	1847	942	559	367	259	192	148	117	95
9000	4647	1896	954	563	369	260	192	148	118	96
10000	4900	1937	965	567	370	260	193	148	112	96
15000	5856	2070	997	578	375	263	194	149	118	96
20000	6489	2144	1014	583	377	264	195	149	118	96
25000	6939	2191	1024	587	379	264	195	150	119	96
Infinitely large	9604	2401	1067	600	384	267	196	150	119	96

For example, if you have a population of 5,000 people and you want the sample percent to be within 4% of the true population value, you should use a sample size of 536.

From: Student Accountability Model Procedures Model, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. August, 1974.

*odds 19 to 1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Henry. *A Harvest of Loneliness: An Inquiry Into a Social Problem*. 1964.

- Detailed investigation of the Bracero program in California.
- Anderson looks in detail at all aspects of the phenomena: Demographics, economies, political implications, discussion of health, housing, etc.
- Comprehensive 700-page report.

Anderson, Henry. "Who Will Guard us from the Guardians?" KPFK address. Berkeley November 1964.

Address over radio by UC Berkeley Student hired to do study on Braceros. "A Harvest of Loneliness" was suppressed by Regents due to political pressure groups.

Anderson describes reactions by University and press, as well as grower interest groups to his research.

- Describes the suppression of his materials.
- Includes address of how the document can be obtained despite its suppression.

Babbie, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. Wadsworth Publishing Co.: California. 1973.

An introductory text to sociological methods which is helpful primarily for quantitative methods. Good sections on Questionnaire Construction and on Statistical Analysis.

Barnes, Robert F. *The California Migrant Farm Worker, His Family and the Rural Community*. Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, UCD. April 1967.

Study of migrant attitudes regarding family, aspirations, religion.

Burning, J.L. and B.L. Kintz. *Computational Handbook of Statistics*. Scott, Foresman, and Co.: Glenview, Illinois. 1968.

This source is primarily of use to give appropriate formula and calculation procedures once the appropriate statistical method and technique have been distinguished.

Carrillo-Beron, Carmen. *Traditional Family Ideology in Relation to Focus of Control: A Comparison of Anglo and Chicano Women*. Psych. Masters Thesis UC. 1971.

- Issue: chicano family is a unique entity: not traditionally Mexican nor adapted to the North American Anglo orientation.
- Tests this hypothesis using "Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFIS) to determine how much the Chicano family is like the Mexican or Anglo family.

Cotera, Martha. *Profile of the Mexican American Woman*. National Education Laboratory Publishers: Texas. 1976.

This report discusses history, sociodemographic characteristics, role perception, and attitudes of Mexican American Women in general throughout the United States. It is of tremendous use as an overview to the real and perceived positions of these women.

Department of Housing and Community Development. *Statistics on Housing Units for Farmworkers by County as of 1965*.

Done by type of shelter and number per county for years 1949 - 1965.

Durant, Bill E. and Silas N. Ragster. *Housing Sacramento's Invisible Men: Farm Workers, Hustlers and Misfits*. Davis: Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Research Monograph No. 10. 1970.

Dworkin, Anthony Gary. "Stereotypes and Self-Images by Native Born and Foreign Born Mexican Americans." *Sociology and Social Research* v. 49 no. 2. January 1965 p. 214.

"Families Who Follow the Crops." Remarks at 2nd Annual Conference made by Director Warne, Department of Agriculture. October 1960.

- Descriptive discussion of conditions at migrant camps and the efforts being made by the various state departments to improve conditions.

"Families Who Follow the Crops." Remarks at 3rd Annual Conference. Topic: Summer schools for children of seasonal farm workers, educational workshop. California State Department of Education.

1. Analysis of problems.
2. Discussion of problems.

"The Farmworker in the '70's: Review of the Past, Hopes for the Future." *El Maleclado*. v. 3, no. 18 Jan. 1, 1970. Short description of the progress and needed support of UFW and the Kennedy Medical Plan begun in August 1969.

Fernandez-Marina, Ramon et. al. "Three Basic Themes in Mexican and Puerto Rican Family Values." *Journal of Social Psychology*. v. 48, Nov. 1958.

The study is primarily focused on Puerto Rican family values. Purpose is to test a set of generally accepted hypotheses on Mexican family roles and values (Diaz-Guerrero's) with regard to the Puerto-Rican family.

Fisher, Donald J. "A Historical Study of the Migrant in California." USC Thesis 1945 (History).

- Fisher's thesis is strictly historical: the emphasis is on how migrants (not just Mexican) figure into American history, specifically California history.
- Deals with broad historical issues; "the social/economic/political impact of Chinese labor, Japanese labor on California — e.g. railroads, foreign land ownership, etc. He is concerned with migrants as factors affecting the overall picture of California history.

Flores, Juan Modesto. "A Study of Mexican-American Cultural Characteristics as Perceived by Members of 100 Impoverished Mexican-American Families and Its Educational Implications." Ed.D. University of Houston 1972.

Problem: The specific purpose of this study was to investigate two general basic questions: (1) Does the low socioeconomic M-A perceive himself as disclosed in the literature? (2) Are there relationships between educational and the seven specific themes: 1. ethnic isolation 2. Spanish language 3. fatalism 4. present day orientation 5. limited aspirations 6. machismo 7. family solidarity?

Galarza, Ernesto. *Merchants of Labor: The Mexican Bracero Story*. Charlotte, N.C.: McNally and Loftin. 1964.

Hawkes, Glenn R. et.al. *Patterns of Living in California's Migrant Labor Families*. Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, UC Davis. August 1973.

- Project is part of a national project to investigate the "plight of the disadvantaged" in California, choosing migrants as their focus of study. Attempts to gather extensive data on farm laborers: e.g.
 - "Who are these people?"
 - "What do they believe?"
 - "How are their lives molded and shaped by the work that they do?"

Hayner, Norman S. "Notes on the Changing Mexican Family." *Sociological Review* 7:489-496, 1942.

Four major elements:

- (1) discussion of features of upper class Mexican family life
- (2) subordination and domestication of women
- (3) discussion of recent changes in Tepoztlán
- (4) notes on recent changes in Mexico City.

Health Department Activities in California Directed Towards the Improvement and Health Among Domestic Seasonal Agricultural Workers and Their Families. 1961.

- Program done in accordance with governor's request July 1960.
- Outlines purposes and objectives in "strengthening community health services for these people"
 - Dr. Merrill, Department of Health.

Health for Harvesters: Decade of Hope 1960-1970." Ten year report by Farmworker Health Services: Bureau of Maternal and Child Care Dec. 1970.

- Report describes existing services, facilities
- Summation of problems
- Report on financial status of program
- Basically a public-relations publication, uses Daily Journal of Public Health worker to show activities of the department.

- Heizer, Robert F. and Alan J. Almquist. *The Other Californians*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1964.
- Hernandez, Gloria Lopez: "Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment of the Select Committee on Aging." House of Representatives. Nov. 12, 1975.
- Statement before Congress on hearings on the aged, "Select Committee on Aging," House of Representatives.
 - From Congressional Record
- Herrera-Duran, Pat and Roberto Cabello-Argandona. "The Chicano: A Preliminary Bibliographic Study."
- Chicano Research Library, Chicano Studies Center, UCLA 90024
 - Synopsis includes listing of books, documents, papers and articles relating to *Chicanos* specifically.
 - Total list of 20 items.
- Hubbell, Linda and Jean Moulder. "The Network of Kinship, Friendship, and Compadrazgo Among Middle-Class Women of Uruapan, Michoacan, Mexico." Dissertation UC 1972.
- Detailed discussion of the ritual dimensions of "compadrazgo" includes definitions and variations of the system.
- Jensen, Jannette J. "Assimilation Among Mexican-Americans: Differences in the Father-Eldest Son Authority Role Relationship as a Function of Social Class, Generation and Assimilation: The Case of Selected Lower and Middle Class Urbanized Mexican-American Families in the San Diego Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area." Ph.D. Dissertation 1974, Fordham University.
- Purpose of study: to identify, measure, and interrelate important components of assimilation, to ascertain whether it is essentially a process of assimilation or social mobility.
 - Contribution of study lies in the development of the assimilation index.
- Lenhart, Margaret Wakeman. "Background For Serving California Migrants." Department of Employment.
- Presentation to Migrant Ministry, Division of Home Missions. Fresno, California. April 26, 1956.
 - Purpose: to provide information on migrants: facts, figures on workers in 1953, '54, '55. (numbers working, etc.)
 - Policy recommendations.
- Longauey y Vasquez, Enriqueta. "The Mexican-American Woman" from *Sisterhood Is Powerful*. ed. Robin Morgan 1970.
- Short article discussing the various dimensions of the oppression of Chicana women and the variations of their conditions given her association with the Chicano male.
 - Call for the unity of the Mexican-American family in a joint struggle towards liberation.
- Loos, Sally Ann. "Cultural Barriers to the Communication of Health Information: The Special Case of the Mexican-American Migrant Workers of California." M.A. Thesis-Journalism, UCB, 1962.
- Study attempts to define areas of cultural differences between Anglo-Americans dispensing public health care and the Mexican-American recipients of that care: hope that such a description will be useful to public health workers.
- Maccoby, Michael. "Love and Authority: A Study of Mexican Villagers." *The Atlantic Monthly* 1964, 213:3.
- Author is psychoanalyst
 - Paper is result of research done with Eric Fromm as part of a U.S. public health fellowship from NIMH.
 - Purpose: To examine a meztizo village which was formerly an hacienda to "discover how the character of the peasant formed by generations of semi-feudal peonage, has changed since the revolution of 1910."
- Macklin, Barbara June. "Structural Stability and Cultural Change in a Mexican-American Community." Dissertation Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania 1963.
- Focus on community of Toledo, Ohio.
 - Examination of processes involved in stability and change in culture using an American ethnic group as a "laboratory."

- Merril, Harriett. *Fresno County*. Report of the Cotton Crops in the West Side of Fresno County: Distribution of government food by the State Emergency Relief Administration. Jan.—Mar. 1935.
- Classic historical report by a State social worker of conditions at this camp. Photographs included.
- "Migrant Families: Trapped in a Life of Poverty." *El Malcriado*. v. 4., no. 11. Dec. 15, 1970. p. 8.
- Description of conditions in Earlimart, Tulare County.
- Padfield, Harlan and William Martin. *Farmers, Workers, and Machines: Technological and Social Change in Farm Industries of Arizona*. University of Arizona Press: Tucson, 1965.
- A socio-economic study of 630 workers in Arizona. Based on interviews with workers, the discussion focuses on harvest system, capital-labor substitution and agricultural labor demand.
- Penalosa, Fernando. "The Changing Mexican-American in Southern California." *Sociology and Social Research, an International Journal*. v. 51, no. 4. July 1967. p. 405.
- Focus is on Southern California and the southwest.
 - Thesis: Mexican-American group is fragmented socially, culturally, ideologically and organizationally.
 - Covers heterogeneity of the group, population characteristics, and discussion of traditionally termed "Mexican Problems."
 - Some discussion of political and social action underway.
- Peterson, Cheryl. *California Farm Labor Survey. Progress Report Prepared for Pattee's California Assembly Committee on Agriculture*. Report 621, 1968.
- Rivera, George Fred. "El Barrio: A Sociological Study of Acculturation in a Mexican-American Community." Dissertation SUNY Buffalo 1971.
- Purposes: (1) develops a model for understanding acculturation in the Mexican-American community (2) to investigate acculturation as an association between structural, cultural and intervening media variables (3) the investigation of the role of intervening variables as test factors.
- Sassen-Kobb. "Non-Dominant Ethnic Populations as a Possible Component of the U.S. Political Economy: The Case of Blacks and Chicanos."
- Object of study* — analyze operation of labor market and role of ethnicity in that market.
- Assumption*: investigation of that market will throw further light on factors that explain the situation of two non-dominant populations.
- Sena, James Richard. "The Survival of the Mexican-American Extended Family: Evidence from a Southern California Town." Sociology Dissertation UCLA 1973.
- Model of U.S. extended family used as treated by Parsons and Litwak: within this context author looks at Mexican extended family as a culture of poverty phenomena.
- Schmitz, William L. and Melvin P. Zobel. *Growing Tomatoes for Mechanical Harvesting*. University of California, Agricultural Extension Service. 1962a.
- Skansie, Juli Ellen. "Death is for All: Death and Death Related Beliefs of Rural Spanish Americans." Anthro. Dissertation Ph.D. Northwestern 1974.
- Interpretation and characteristics of "Death Model" as viewed by informants are examined.
 - Psycho-social features examined as well.
- St. John, Edward. *The Plight of Unemployed Single Farm Workers*. Davis: Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Research Monograph, No. 14. 1974.

Staples, Robert. "The Mexican-American Family: It's Modification over Time and Space." *Phylon*. 1971. 32:179-192.

Premise: In order to understand Mexican-American family structure one must examine the small isolated villages from which they have evolved.

- A. Historical Perspective of the Mexican-American Family
- B. Family Structure
- C. Family Roles — Divides analysis into discussion of maternal-paternal and child-parent roles.
- D. Discussion of Courtship and Marriage.

Talbot, Jane Mitchell. *Comprehensive Chicano, Bibliography*. 1960-1972.

Temple-Trujillo, Rita E. "Conceptions of the Chicano Family." *Smith College Studies In Social Work*. 1974, 45. Nov. p. 1-20.

- Critical examination of existing literature on the Chicano family because author feels that present images do not reflect the essential nature of family as experienced by many Chicanos. Looks at "classical" studies of Chicano history, anthropological and sociological perspectives as well as psychoanalytic.

Tharp, Ronald G. et.al. "Changes in Marriage Roles Accompanying the Acculturation of the Mexican-American Wife." *Journal of Marriage and Family Life*. 1968, 30, 3 Aug. 404-412.

Study confirms the hypothesis that during acculturation of the Mexican-American wife, marriage roles change toward a more egalitarian-companionate pattern, or in Rainwater's terms, from a segregated to a joint conjugal role pattern.

Thomas, Robert J. *The Future of Trade Unions in Agriculture*. Santa Cruz: University of California, Board of Community Studies, Senior Thesis. 1974.

Thurston, Richard G. "Urbanization and Socio-cultural Change in a Mexican-American Enclave." UCLA Dissertation 1957.

- Study of community called "Pueblo" in Los Angeles.
- Aim to examine nature and extent of changes in family structure, functions and interpersonal relationships given the shift from agricultural to urban conditioning life.

Van Den Berghe, Gwendoline and Pierre. "Compadrazgo and Class in Southeastern Mexico." *American Anthropologist*, 1966 vol. 68.

Study of town: San Cristobel de las Casas.

- Looks at social stratification, compadrazgo and class in San Cristobel.
- Gives good descriptive accounts of demographic features of the town.
- Studies the dimensions of compadrazgo in detail with respect to class variations.

Wagley, Charles and Marvin Harris. "A Typology of Latin American Subcultures." *American Anthropologist*. v. 57, 1955.

Purpose: to suggest a taxonomic system of subcultures distinguishing nine Latin American subcultural types.

- In-depth description and outline of these nine groups ranging from Tribal Indian to urban proletariat.

Weaver, Jerry L. "Mexican-American Health Care Behavior: A Critical View of the Literature." *Health Politics, A Quarterly Bulletin*. vol. 4, no. 2, Feb. '74. (Berkeley Inst. Gov't. Affairs Lib.)

- Author divides Mexican-American population by generation and characterizes each by what exists in the literature regarding their attitudes towards health/illness.

Weiner, Sandra. *Small Hands Big Hands: Seven Profiles of Chicano Migrant Workers and Their Families*.

- Short photographic narrative of selected case studies (ethnographics) of various Chicano farmworkers.
- Suggested by author to be used as a children's book due to the style of presentation.

Wycoff, Florence. "Health Projects for Migrant Farm Families — 1963, California's Experience." Washington National Consumers Committee for Research and Education Inc.

- Descriptive account of:
 - (1) Unemployment, sickness, etc. In Fresno County Cotton Camps 1949.
 - (2) Emergency measures to meet total infant diarrhea epidemic.
 - (3) Development of Camp health Committees.
 - (4) 1st Annual Conference of "Families Who Follow the Crops" March 1959.
 - (5) Proposals to legislature for improved health conditions and changes resulting from SB282.

Zarrugh, Laura Hoffman. "Gente De Mi Tierra: Mexican Village Migrants in a California Community." Anthro. Dissertation UC. 1974.

- Focus on the adjustment to life in the U.S. by immigrants from Jacala, Mexico.
- Looks at money matters, community organization, health, religion, family, perceptions of self in the U.S. (specifically the S.F. Bay Area and Mission District).